INTELLIGENT PARENTHOOD



PLANNED PARENTHOOD/ALAMEDA COUNTY
482 WEST MacARTHUR BOULEVARD
OAKLAND, CA. 94609

PLANNED PARENTHOOD LEAGUE
482 WEST MacARTHUR BLVD.
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94609

Family Planning Reference Library
University of California
School of Public Health
414 Acheson Building
Berkeley 94720

INTELLIGENT PARENTHOOD

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LIMITED
SHANGHAI

INTELLIGENT PARENTHOOD

Proceedings of the Mid-West Conference on Parent Education, March 4, 5, and 6 1926

THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION FOR CHILD STUDY AND PARENT EDUCATION



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO · ILLINOIS

PLANNED PARENTHOOD/ALAMEDA COUNTY
482 WEST MacARTHUR BOULEVARD
OAKLAND, CA. 94609

COPYRIGHT 1926 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

All Rights Reserved

Published August 1926

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

FOREWORD

Through publication of the present volume the proceedings of the Mid-West Conference on Child Study and Parent Education will be made generally available.

The interest in this Conference shown by the citizens of Chicago was extraordinary. The attendance far surpassed the most optimistic anticipations and gave impressive testimony that the people of America are alive to the most fundamental duty of man. Surely no duty lies before each generation more vital than the training of the next generation to greater mental and physical health and social fitness. We have faith in education, and support a vast educational system. But the importance of the whole formal system is trivial compared to that of home influence and training in those vital formative years beginning at birth, when mental action patterns are determined.

The desire of parents for accurate knowledge to aid them in their responsibilities is a most wholesome sign of the scientific temper of mind of our day. This volume goes forth to them, rich in its potentialities for the increase of human happiness.

MAX MASON

CONTENTS

PAGE

ADDRESS OF WELCOME. *Mrs. Eva L. Lawton* 1

THE CHILD, THE HOME, AND THE COMMUNITY

THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE MODERN HOME. *Dr. Werrett Wallace Charters* 9

THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE FAMILY TO THE DEMANDS OF PRESENT-DAY COMMUNITY LIFE. *Dr. Mathilda Castro Tufts* 15

MOBILIZING THE HOME FOR MENTAL HEALTH. *Margaret Gray Blanton* 33

HEALTH

NEED OF CONTINUOUS HEALTH SUPERVISION. *Dr. Caroline Hedger* 47

A NEW DISCOVERY OF AN OLD POWER—SUNLIGHT. *Dr. Martha M. Eliot* 58

THE TIRED CHILD—RECOGNITION AND MANAGEMENT. *Dr. Max Seham* 71

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EARLY YEARS

INTRODUCTION. *Edna N. White* 85

THE NURSERY SCHOOL AND THE PRESENT SOCIAL ORDER. *Patty Smith Hill* 87

THE MOTIVATION OF THE YOUNG CHILD. *John E. Anderson* 98

DETERMINISMS IN CHILDHOOD. *Dr. Ira S. Wile* . . . 112

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION: RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES IN NURSERY SCHOOLS

PAGE

PHYSICAL HEALTH PROGRAM. *Mary E. Murphy* . . . 133

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM. *Ethel Kawin* 139

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION: SEX EDUCATION

SEX EDUCATION VERSUS SEX INFORMATION. *Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg* 153

SEX EDUCATION IN SCHOOL—THE WINNETKA PLAN. *Carleton Washburne* 160

METHOD OF TEACHING SEX. *Willard W. Beatty* . . . 166

SEX EDUCATION AND PARENTS. *Dr. Rachelle S. Yarros* . 174

PROBLEMS OF THE ADOLESCENT—CAN THE PARENT UNDERSTAND?

THE IMPERATIVE AIMS IN ADOLESCENT TRAINING. *William H. Burnham* 183

CONFRONTING THE WORLD—THE ADJUSTMENT OF LATER ADOLESCENCE. *Frankwood E. Williams* 195

TRAINING FOR CHARACTER

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS. *Frederick C. Woodward* . . . 217

THE FATHER'S RESPONSIBILITY IN THE TRAINING OF HIS CHILDREN. *Henry Neumann* 222

THE RELATION OF INTELLIGENCE TO CHARACTER. *Dr. Ira S. Wile* 233

THE CHILD, THE HOME, AND THE SCHOOL

THE PRESCHOOL CHILD AND THE PRESENT-DAY PARENT. *Dr. Arnold Gesell* 255

PAGE

The Influence of Parent and Teacher on the Intellectual Development of School Children. *Walter F. Dearborn* 267

Direct Instruction in Moral and Civic Education. *Ernest Horn* 280

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION: CULTURAL NEEDS OF THE CHILD

Cultural Influence of Music. *Mrs. Mary Root Kern* 300

Creative Dancing. *Mrs. Margaret Schulv Kranz* . . 311

INDEX

Index 323

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

Mrs. Eva L. Lawton, Chairman, Chicago Association for Child Study and Parent Education

In the name of the Chicago Association for Child Study and Parent Education, I want to welcome all of you this morning to our conference. We are inviting you to meet with us today, not in a spirit of triumph to exhibit the fruits of our accomplishment, but rather in a spirit of humbleness to ask you to assist us in planting a seed, which we hope will sprout and grow into a thing of beauty.

Our association is organized for a twofold purpose: to study the child and to educate the parent. We feel that each is essential to the whole idea, and each valueless without the other. We are still in the groping stage. But such was our faith in the importance of the idea we had to offer that we felt we would, if necessary, create an opportunity to present it to our city and the Middle West. And so eager were we to do it, that we did not wait until we were old and hoary and perfected in organization, but we plunged right in after less than a year of existence. From the response we have received to our conference program, our radio talks, and our general publicity, we are convinced that this desire for more intelligent and more efficient parenthood is a universal one. It is not confined to any one group or social status. All conscientious parents feel the need of being better fitted to guide and assist their children. Civilization daily grows more intricate. The task of wisely directing the lives of those depending

upon us for guidance daily becomes more difficult, and we must make every effort to rise to the occasion and not fail in giving the child the help it needs. From its earliest babyhood up, through infancy, preschool, school age, and adolescence, the child should feel that we understand him, sympathize with him, and rejoice in him, and that we can minister to his needs, be they physical, mental, or emotional.

Child study, in the sense in which we use it, is not an ancient science, but one that dates back not more than forty or fifty years. In the United States, it has as yet been confined to a comparatively small group, even though its possibilities are practically unlimited. The thought and purpose behind this conference is to give publicity to the idea, to bring before fathers and mothers the knowledge that much more could be accomplished with the problems of childhood, and ultimately with the problems of all ages, if intelligence were brought to bear in their handling of them. Much may be left to the school, much may be left to the religious instructor, much may be left to the family physician, but unless the home furnishes co-operation by a proper background and an environment of serenity, of thoughtful planning, of intelligence and direction, the work of all the other agencies is neutralized. From the home must radiate the spirit of guidance. The guiding hand must be gentle and loving, but it must be firm and wise as well. The child senses all that is wrong in the home atmosphere; the relationship between father and mother, the relationship of brothers and sisters toward each other and of parents to each individual child, is all reflected in the child's conduct. To make all these proper adjustments in the home is the parents' task. In our

groups we study these daily practical problems, the problems of the normal parents of the normal child.

The book is an inspiring teacher, free discussion is a still greater one. The study group should combine the advantages of both. It is an open forum for the discussion of the perplexing questions that arise in connection with the child in the various stages of its development and its various relationships, as well as a school for the study of the various scientific theories in the same line. The study group as we have conducted it in Chicago may be much in need of improvement. We make no claim to having perfected means or methods. It is yet in its early beginnings, and we hope that with the entering of new and larger groups into our organization, we will be able to make much improvement. But we do claim that anyone who enters a group openmindedly, with the spirit of the student, seeking knowledge and inspiration, will derive much benefit therefrom.

To act as a clearing-house between the expert, the scientist, and the parent, to relay to the parent the mass of material, of research, and experimentation that has been compiled in the laboratory, after reducing it to workable terms, to help us to acquire both the knowledge and the technique to perform this job of parenthood in the finest possible manner, is the function of the study group. Through the group, the experimental data will be simplified and clarified and brought home, in practical and understandable terms to the ultimate consumer, the parent.

Scientists are stressing more and more the fact that the broad foundations of character are laid in the very early years, that all bad habits, all neuroses, have their origins in the childish years; that it is much more than

difficult, indeed almost impossible, to change habits once formed. In fact it has been said, "We are the habit." The realization of this truth makes the wise control of the early impressionable years of paramount significance. Furthermore it is recognized that all social welfare and communal progress must be planned and the foundations thereof laid in the early years of any generation. How keenly then should we feel our duties and responsibilities!

In planning our program for this conference, we have tried to present a general picture of the child's life, his early youth and adolescence, his physical, mental, and emotional side, his spiritual needs, the father's responsibility, and educational, social, and cultural factors. The picture we shall attempt to draw is that of the normal aspects of the life of the average child in the modern home. In the short time at the command of each speaker, hardly more than a few points can be stressed. But our object will be accomplished if we stimulate those who are already studying to renewed and deeper effort, and inspire those who are not with the wish to do so.

In the organization of our child-study groups and in the planning of this conference, we have received inspiration and help from the Child Study Association of America, which has headquarters at New York and with whom we are affiliated. The New York group has been engaged in the dissemination of child-study information for many years. They have widened the field so as to include not only group members of the average home type, but on the one hand have introduced child study into the home economics departments of colleges in the East, and on the other hand have given it to the immigrant and the poorly circumstanced mother. All these things we also hope to do

here. New York has sent to us for this conference two representatives, Mrs. Sidonie Gruenberg, the director of the organization, and Mrs. Daphne Drake, its vice-chairman, and we are happy indeed to have them with us. Mrs. Drake has kindly consented to be the chairman of our first session.

THE CHILD, THE HOME, AND THE COMMUNITY

THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE MODERN HOME

Dr. Werrett Wallace Charters, Professor of Education, University of Chicago

You will notice by the program that I am pinch-hitting for Dr. Groves. This is very fortunate for me because I have observed through long experience that an excellent way for me to get a large audience is to have someone else announced in my place.

When Mrs. Schwartz hurriedly called me last night to ask whether I could take the place of the speaker who could not be here because of illness, she told me what his topic was and wanted to know if I could speak on the subject. I replied that since I had but one speech, the title was quite immaterial.

I am, however, very deeply interested in this topic, "The Opportunity of the Modern Home." My interest arises from two sources. In the first place, I have some children of my own, and I have been an interested spectator in watching my wife bring them up. From her I have learned a very great deal. In the second place, I am interested in the problems of the home because for years I have been working upon the problems of training teachers. In this long association with teachers and schools I have come to feel with increasing intensity that training given in the home is the most important of all the training given anywhere in the world. Although we are inclined to criticize the home for its shortcomings and are tending more and more to delegate to the schools many of the

things that should be taught in the home, the family still remains the central agency of education. If it fails, there is nothing to be substituted for it.

The topic presented this morning is well phrased as "The Opportunity of the Modern Home." I shall mention four. As I see it, the first opportunity of the home in the training of children is to teach them obedience. In the last few decades there has appeared in the theories of training a great deal of discussion of the self-determination of children and the preservation of their individuality. Many people feel that children should be permitted to solve their problems for themselves without undue pressure from parents and teachers.

While this is an interesting theory, it is not an adequate one. It is merely a compensation for the tendency of many homes in the past, and some in the present, to coerce children arbitrarily to do things which are fundamentally bad for them. It is a dangerous theory because of the fact that human society demands conformity on the part of individuals. In America there is no substitute for learning the English language. We *must* learn to read. We are compelled by the exigencies of society to be punctual. Thousands of conventions are laid down by society today—conventions which are often institutionalized and crystallized. Whether he likes it or not, every individual must conform to these conventions if he is to be either efficient or happy. If he does not conform, society brings all sorts of pressure to bear upon him. He may be jailed for certain kinds of non-conformity. For other less serious kinds he may be criticized, censured, or ridiculed; and as a result of this he may become soured, disappointed, and even neurasthenic.

If the home does not develop obedience, society will demand it and get it. It is therefore better for the home with its kindliness, sympathy, and understanding to train the child in obedience rather than callously to leave him to the brutal and unsympathetic discipline that society will impose if the home has not already fulfilled this obligation.

There may be many people in this audience who do not agree with this point of view. They may feel that, after all, the individuality of the child is the important and compelling factor in his education. With this I agree; but I differ as to the method to be employed. A person's individuality is best safeguarded and developed through initial conformity with social conventions. After he has learned the rules of the game he may hope to modify them; but until he has learned them, his attempts at modification will be amateurish. If these rules are never learned, the person's individuality is cramped and his happiness constricted.

It is quite definitely my opinion that the time when obedience can best be taught is during the period which lies below the school age. At the ages of two, three, and four years the battle of obedience is fought. If it is won at that time, then when the child later becomes an adolescent, the problem is not at all serious. If the battle is lost at that time, the child is going to be very unhappy.

It is perfectly clear to me, then, that one of the chief opportunities of the home is to teach obedience to the children. Moreover, obedience should be taught early in life so that eventually the children will be able within reasonable limits to conform happily to social conventions.

A second opportunity of equal importance lies in as-

sisting children and parents to develop a rational attitude toward the problems of life. What I mean is this. When we come face to face with problems that are of concern to us, we may settle them by considering what was done years ago when we were young, by giving weight to our prejudices, or by our own desires of the moment. A better way, however, is to look these problems squarely in the face and to arrive at a good solution through the use of reason. We cannot settle the problems of today on the basis of the solutions of twenty-five years ago. Actions that were considered proper when I was a boy are now thought to be improper; and behavior that was then considered quite impolite or immoral is now thought to be courteous and moral. When we have conflicts with our boys and girls, differences of opinion emerge—the differences between the point of view of youth and maturity.

In such cases we must be careful not to be arbitrary. If we embrace the opportunities the home offers for developing a rational attitude toward the problems of life, we shall meet the difficulty by saying, "Folks, here is the situation; let us sit down and talk it over." We need to have our own opinions about proper lines of action. We must have strong ideals; but we need to realize that reason should be the foundation of morality. The home can help the child to reason out his problems when he comes face to face with them; and this is a very wonderful opportunity.

A third opportunity that should be embraced is to teach children and parents the methods of controlling fears and worries. Most of us do not reach our full capacity because of anxieties. Men in business seldom break because of overwork; they become incapacitated because

of worry. Women who become nervous wrecks reach this condition not because they work too hard, but because they worry too much.

Unfortunately, or fortunately, most of the nervous troubles and worries of adults can be traced back to childhood. Incidents and series of events which happened when they were two, three, four, or even ten years of age are often the causes of later maladjustments. The home can perform no more valuable service for little children than to teach them how to overcome and control their worries and anxieties.

Finally, the home can become a haven where the children are sheltered from the storms of worry and trouble encountered outside the home. Home is a place of friendship and happiness. It need not be quiet or orderly, but it should be a place where all the members of the family believe in each other and are friendly toward one another. Somewhere in life every individual needs to have a place of recourse where he meets people who, while recognizing his faults, are conscious of his very fine qualities and on the whole believe in him. Somewhere we must have people who can listen sympathetically to our troubles and likewise share with us our joys and happiness. The one place where this can be done best is in the home.

Yet, unfortunately, in many homes the members of the family live in the relation of friendly enemies. They criticize each other, and are habitually irritable. In such cases the members of the home very frequently have no place to go for relaxation and happiness. Oftentimes the petty worries of the day cannot easily be shaken from the shoulders at homecoming. Undoubtedly, members of the home are often irritating to each other; but the important

point is that in spite of all this, each member should attempt to act in such a way that the spirit of the family will be one of relaxation and happiness rather than of tension and irritation.

When I mention these four opportunities, I am not talking about anything new. They are as old as civilization, as old as the home; but they are so important that I shall repeat them. The first opportunity is to teach the children to be obedient; the second is to teach them to be reasonable in their conduct; the third is to develop methods of controlling fears and worries; and the fourth and last is to provide a harbor into which the family may enter and be protected from the worries, hostilities, and irritations of life.

THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE FAMILY TO THE DEMANDS OF PRESENT-DAY COMMUNITY LIFE

Dr. Mathilda Castro Tufts, Formerly Head of the Department of Education, Bryn Mawr College

Before passing to the direct consideration of the subject upon which I have been asked to speak, namely, "The Adjustment of the Family to the Demands of Present-Day Community Life," I should like to say something about the attitude, or as the psychologist calls it the "mental set" in which to approach our problems. In so doing I shall not be digressing from my topic but shall be discussing an aspect of present-day community life of which this gathering today is an instance. I refer to the adult-education movement of which I presume parent education may be considered a part.

Parent education seems to me a social movement of unique significance. It is as if society had found a new institution to replace the older institution of the family circle. We know how the family, yielding to changes, economic, social, and industrial, is no longer the integrated institution it once was. We know that such a seemingly unimportant change as living in an apartment rather than a house makes impossible the maintenance of the old family privacy. Of the disadvantages of these changes and the compensations which must be made for them I shall speak briefly later, but I wish now to emphasize what seems to me a fortunate circumstance: we are not so much losing the father and the mother as we are finding the

parent. Hugh Walpole's novel *The Green Mirror* gives an admirable picture of the mother who would inclose her family within the circumference of its own reflected light. Every teacher is familiar with the little child's family provincialism—each story, each incident referred to in the schoolroom is matched by "My mother saw this"; "My father went there." It is by appealing to parents as parents, by bringing them to consider the meaning of childhood, and the welfare of children in other homes as well as in their own, that a large contribution can be made toward lifting the level of community life. I can illustrate the drift of my meaning by a story brought into the community by Mrs. W. I. Thomas, whose brother was a witness of its occurrence in a southern court. A colored mother, who was being tried for the unusually cruel treatment of her son, interrupted the judge's severe reprimand and said: "Before you go any fu'ther, Judge, I jes wants to ask yuh one question and dat's all I's got to say. I asks yuh, Judge, was you ever de payrent of a puffickly wuthless collud chile?"

Now that degree of capacity for vicariousness, of exchanging places imaginatively with another, is perhaps too much to expect of a parent, but I believe that such a movement as this for parent education will go a long way toward developing a larger sympathy and understanding of other people's children as well as of our own; and when that happy day arrives one of our most difficult problems of adjustment to community conditions will "fold its tent like the Arabs and as silently steal away."

There is no magic to effect this result in the mere multiplication of centers, or by the increased industry in any one center of child study and parent education. The

education of adults may become a matter of merely piling up information, the thrill of an inspirational talk or entertainment, or of establishing connection with people who are "doing things" or of satisfying intellectual curiosity. These are not unworthy motives in themselves, but they do not help much in securing educational progress. In his small book on chemical warfare, J. B. S. Haldane gives an incident which points a moral:

> On a German war vessel were found a number of gas masks. These masks were examined by a British physiological chemist and pronounced worthless because they offered no protection for the nose. Ignoring the advice of the expert, those in authority acted upon their general belief in the cleverness of the Germans in scientific matters, and sent in an order for the British women to make masks of this pattern in great numbers, with terrible fatalities as the result.

On the basis of such experiences as these Haldane is led to define education as "a process which puts people in general in touch with the thought of abler minds of their own and past times, whether in literature or art, in science, mathematics, or music."

Now this is an age of scientific revolution as surely as the nineteenth century was an age of industrial revolution, and such agencies as the various clubs and organizations similar to this are necessary to keep us in touch with the daily returns of scientific progress. But mere information from all of these sources cannot be accumulated without producing mental indigestion which may be disastrous to the intelligent application of it. I speak from the experience I have had with the distress of spirit and the confusion of mind which have prompted some of the ques-

tions which mothers have asked me. You suggest that the intelligent choice of some leader to guide will solve the difficulty. Yes and no. By depending upon a leader to supply you with an authoritative view of life or with a formula for simplifying its complexities, or for solving your specific difficulties, you are not being educated.

What you can get from the experts who speak to you is an attitude, a way of going at your own first-hand study, with a certain amount of information to use as a point of departure. You will never get information which will tell you what to do in such and such a case. You must get principles and depend upon your own intelligence to apply them. A study of cases will aid you in your own analysis but it will not provide a ready-made answer to your problem.

Parent education must be a mutual affair. The information which you receive must be made over in terms of your own experience and attempt at application, and you must carry back the results of your reconstruction of the material, if not in the form of a direct contribution, at least in the form of a heightened power of critical judgment of what scientists and educators bring to you. Two attitudes which the educator encounters hamper rather than help him. One is the suspicious and jealous resentment of his experimenting with *your* child, and the other the surrender of all responsibility, the "I-don't-know-what-they-are-doing-but-I-have-complete-confidence-in-them" attitude. Being human, the educator prefers the latter but it is not of much value to him in the long run. He needs your aid in multiplying his works by the increase of informed intelligence about education in your

community; and he will be the better leader if you are able to evaluate his work intelligently.

Adults who voluntarily come to listen to talks presumably rank higher than other members of the community in openmindedness, or they would not submit to being talked at. But openmindedness should not mean empty-mindedness. Mental hospitality, the willingness to entertain a new idea, does not mean that you need to adopt your guest at once as a member of your family. It is good neither for the speakers nor for his hearers to have his utterances regarded as oracular. I have suffered much embarrassment from having my own pronouncements so treated, occasionally, as for example, when I am asked by a mother whom I have never encountered except in an audience about a child whom I have never seen: "My child does thus and so. What shall I do?" I am sure that the Delphic Apollo never had to answer a question like that. A psychoanalyst requires months of observation of his patient and makes him expose every shred of his life before he ventures an opinion, the physician makes a careful examination of his patient's history, etc., and the psychologist takes at least time enough for a thorough mental examination, and yet one is asked to prescribe from the platform. I used to make some attempt at this sort of absent treatment, but then my knowledge was pretty much a textbook affair, whereas now I have a very little understanding of real children.

Nothing gets in the way of clear thinking more surely than emotion. Although our thinking is actuated by emotion, by the keen desire to find the solution to this or that pressing problem, yet if we care too much about the outcome, our thinking is disturbed. I suppose that there is

nothing in the world so difficult as to think about our children without emotion. I have seen men and women, open-minded and impartial in other matters, when their children were concerned, let emotional bias get in the way of a fair judgment that almost any unprejudiced observer could make. Once I suggested to a group of mothers who knew each other well that it might be helpful to discuss their own and each other's children. I thought that it would give the mothers a good opportunity to get an outsider's point of view and that since the discussion would be open and above board, the critic would attempt to be fair and objective, and the group would check up any overstatement or lack of discrimination. The instantaneous alarm and horror which "registered," as they say in the movies, was my answer, and I felt the emotional shock almost as an electrical charge on the platform. One mother made what seemed to me an admirable suggestion, however, and that was to exchange children occasionally with your friends. Of course no one took the suggestion seriously, but such a plan might do much to cultivate a new perspective: parents of children, and children of parents—the quality of vicariousness of which I spoke earlier.

In this three-day session, scientists will speak to you, each from his own viewpoint. The individual scientist is not so much concerned with interpretation as he is with the presentation of facts. Yet interpretation creeps in and he draws conclusions from them, which taken absolutely, are often negative and destructive. Another investigator gives his piece of truth as his laboratory has revealed it without reference to the results of his brother-scientist. Without realizing that one may provide the

antidote for the other, you act in accordance with the conclusions of one, and worry about the consequences of the theories of the other. An illustration of this situation may be found in your anxiety over the fatalism of the psychologists who believe in a fixed mental endowment which education cannot increase, as contrasted with the faith in environment in mental as well as physical and moral traits which you evidence in your cordial acceptance of the nursery- or preschool-child movement.

Confusion as a temporary stage is not an undesirable state of mind. The mind which absorbs everything is a great deal like a piece of blotting paper. Confusion is at least a sign that ideas are meeting and coming into conflict with each other. All thinking worthy of the name starts from some conflict, some doubt, and one of the first steps is to search about for all the information there is in stock to help solve the problem. If you get some slight mental confusion from three days of strenuous listening to speakers who are working intensively each from his own vantage point, there is no cause for discouragement. On the contrary, you are on the way to thinking for yourself. If such an experience brings home the fact that education is a continuous life-job which no one can do for you, you have traveled far. Indeed it seems to me that the baffling complexity of our present social life has done much to bring about a pretty widespread realization of the fact that education is a life-long necessity. And if it has done that the present age is not so bad as our pessimists paint it.

A few days ago, in the course of an educational discussion, a woman of mature years said: "When I was a young teacher, the church took care of a child's spirit, the

home of his manners and morals, and the school of his intellect. Now the whole care of the child is dumped on the school even to his eyes and teeth." There was implied in her further comments some blame of the family, but more explicitly the school was censured for failing to develop character.

This commentary on present-day conditions made by a person of intelligence and discrimination on the basis of her own observation and experience of educational and community changes seemed to me to provide a fitting point of departure for my talk.

As to the changes in functions she could hardly have summed up the facts more accurately and tersely. But the recognition that she was stating a law of social change would have deleted the note of personal blame for these changes. The law—and it is well to remember that in this sense a law is a statement of uniformities which have been observed to occur in the past—is that the school must be expected to assume certain new functions as other institutions cease to exercise them; that when, because of changes in social, economic, and industrial conditions, the home and community are unable to provide direct opportunities for the development of desirable moral-social qualities the school must, as an institution set apart for education, attempt to compensate for their loss.

The school has been called a miniature society, or that is what it should be to meet the requirements of a good school today. But this does not mean that it should duplicate what is going on in society, especially in such a complex one as ours. Dewey says that the functions of the school in this respect are threefold:

The first office of the social organ we call the school is to provide a simplified environment. It selects the features which are fairly fundamental and capable of being responded to by the young.

In the second place, it is the business of the school environment to eliminate, so far as possible, the unworthy features of the existing environment from influence upon mental habitudes. It establishes a purified medium of action. . . . . It weeds out what is undesirable.

In the third place, it is the office of the school environment to balance the various elements in the social environment, and to see to it that each individual escapes from the limitations of the social group in which he was born, and to come into living contact with a broader environment. . . . . The intermingling in the school of youth of different races, differing religions, and unlike customs creates for all a new and broader environment.

Thus it is obvious that the school must supply conditions indirectly which once prevailed when home and community were integrated and when they furnished the material and technique for education in its fullest sense, including the education of character.

We recall the picture so often quoted from Dewey's account of the household in which were carried on, or about which were clustered, all the typical forms of industrial occupations. I quote only his statements as to the educative value of this situation in order to use it as the basis for later interpretations in my paper.

We cannot overlook the factors of discipline and character building involved in this kind of life: training in habits of order and of industry, and in the idea of responsibility, of obligation to do something, in the world. There was always something which really needed to be done, and a real necessity that each member of the household should do his part faithfully and in co-operation with

others. Personalities which become effective in action were bred and tested in the medium of action. Again we cannot overlook the importance for educational purposes of the close and intimate acquaintance got with nature at first hand, with real things and materials, with the actual processes of manipulation, and the knowledge of their social necessities and uses. In all this there was the continual training of observation, of ingenuity, constructive imagination and the sense of reality acquired through the first hand contact with actualities.

It is obvious that if the school is to take care of the intellect of the child it must aim at something more than so-called intellectual training; it must provide for the development of the social and moral qualities which condition effective mental growth. The three R's unadorned might well have been the school's sole concern in former days, because they could take on vital meaning as tools in the home. But today they are empty of that meaning.

Whenever the cry is raised that our schools are lax in discipline, the sovereign remedy is sure to be a return to the "good old-fashioned discipline" of the three R's and the like. As if anything could restore to them that "good old-fashioned discipline" which they never possessed in their own right at all. Indeed the schools are finding that instead of their being in themselves such fine old disciplinary stuff, they are best mastered when they take on meaning in concrete problems. Thus we have instance after instance of pupils who, failing to master them after years of sheer drill in the grades, make good their deficiencies rapidly when put into the junior high school where there is an opportunity to apply them to some concrete interest. I dwell upon the case of the three R's as a sort of symbol, or analogy, to which I shall recur.

Is the school failing to develop character, does it omit instruction in morals? In so far as the school is attempting to provide opportunities for the development of fundamental moral and social qualities it cannot be said that it is unmindful of its problem. Moreover it is doing more to accomplish the result than it would were it to provide instruction in the theory of morals instead. Dewey makes the distinction between "moral ideas" and the "ideas about morality." Ideas about morality may remain merely ideas and never lead to the practice of morality; moral ideas are ideas which move to action, which get themselves carried out. Between the idea and the act, however, is the long process of learning how, that is, moral ideas must be "bred in action," developed by action in real situations. Every opportunity which the school presents for fair play, honesty, co-operation, social responsiveness, openmindedness, industry, for the appreciation of the meaning and practice of orderliness, obedience, and respect for law, is an opportunity for the development of these qualities. Every time a child is encouraged to think a problem through, to find the means for carrying out a plan, to persist in his effort to overcome obstacles in his way of securing them, and finally to see the task through to completion, he is being led to develop the fundamental qualities of moral character.

Perhaps we can see why it has been easier for the school than for the home to provide these opportunities. Besides the home is having less and less contact with children because of the lengthened school year. And now that the nursery school is gaining vogue, the influence of the school will be still greater. But because moral qualities are built up through practice, and not by being talked at

or preached at, home as well as school must take part in furnishing the right conditions for the formation of these habits. I should like to suggest that I can think of nothing that would be more helpful to parents and teachers than some knowledge of moral theory, or ethics. You will not make the mistake of thinking that I mean that instruction in theory should be given to young children. To know how moral habits are formed, and what opportunities there are for their formation in the simplest situations of everyday life in school, in the home, and in the community would obviously be of great service.

I wish now to consider one problem of adjustment which centers in the so-called lack of authority in the home. Everywhere we hear that modern parents have no authority over their children. I am going to cut short my analysis by letting a story explain my point. A boy of five years was absorbed in cutting out a picture which had to be put together to make a pattern. He was told that in a few minutes he must put away his things and get ready to go home. He protested vigorously and there was every sign of a coming struggle should the suggestion be enforced. In another minute the clock struck five, and sitting up on his heels, he counted the strokes silently, rose, and said, "The clock strikes five to go home." Much nervous wear and tear between parents and children would be eliminated if we could relinquish the idea of authority as a test of personal power and put the source of authority more and more in objective situations. Often we issue trivial and arbitrary commands just to make sure that our authority is there, unquestioned, and in full working trim. When parents lament their lack of authority, they do not quite realize what they are saying. There really never

was that parental authority which they imagine. It is much as if the three R's would lament the passing of their erstwhile disciplinary power. It is a mistaken idea of the nature of authority which is to blame for a great deal of family friction. If we could divest ourselves of our pride in authority as a personal and parental attribute we should find it again. The father of the family in the days we have pictured got his authority not from himself as a sort of invested right, but from his situation. Children accept what is natural and obvious. When work is to be done and each has a responsible part, they recognize the need of a head to give direction and guidance, and he receives the obedience which the situation calls for. A child who has seen the long process of labor required to turn out a product does not make extravagant demands. The child in a large family today is not likely to attribute his parent's refusal to grant him an indulgence to mere "stinginess" or meanness. But the modern child who makes "selfish" or "unreasonable" demands sees nothing of the economic process involved and cannot be expected to know by intuition, or to accept on a mere say-so what has taken a long training for adults to understand.

The problem of authority is of course not to be dismissed in a word, but I believe that if, so far as possible, it is made to come from the need of situations of which the child is really a part, an attitude of confidence will be established which will carry over into occasions where it is inadvisable or dangerous for the child to question the authority of their elders. Confidence in the kindness or affection of parents is not necessarily the same thing as acceptance of their authority. Too many parents think resentment of authority, or disobedience, is a mark of in-

gratitude and feel especially unhappy if children do not repay their kindness with an acceptance of their authority. An incident came to my notice lately. A boy whose father played with him a great deal, who prided himself on being a "regular pal," was shocked to have his boy say after he had felt it necessary to whip him: "Well, you're bigger and you can do it." This, I take it, is an illustration of my point. A father's participation in his children's play sometimes, "when he gets the time," is admirable, but it does not serve as a logical basis for the understanding of the relation of authority as does participation in some serious work together—an association which will make children feel that they are a real part of their parents' lives.

But what a tremendous sacrifice of one's own interest such participation would entail! After all one is more than a mother and father—one is a wife or husband. One is a wife for instance, and a husband's interests as provider, etc., his needs for recreation and all the rest must come first. Of course there is the possibility of sending the children off to a good school. I say this not in sarcasm. It is better to be honest and recognize that you cannot bring up your children properly, or that you cannot pay the price of their best development. It rejoices the heart of an educator that a mother is able to say that the most precious thing which her children got from going away to a good school was the contact with mature men and women of fine personalities and the influence of their high standards and ideals. One wishes however that these "wares of the soul" could be had at home.

In the problem of the adjustment of the family to the community, this matter of participation comes up again.

The conflict between family and community becomes critical in regard to differences in standards and ideals. Those of the family are, of course, excellent; those of the community inferior. It is again the contrast between democracy and excellence which has been much stressed recently. We try to retain the excellence of the one by shutting out the corrupting influence of the other, from the day when the gate is slammed upon that little boy next door who has taught your three-year old to turn upon you with "You old mutt," to the day when Mary complains that "Jane's mother never makes her do any housework," or John remonstrates that "all the fellas in the junior high send flowers to the girls and take them in taxis to parties." And so with standards of dress, speech, reading, amusements, behavior between the sexes. The day has gone by, if it ever existed, when we can control our children simply by shutting out environmental influences which menace them. Moreover, standards, ideals, and appreciations are not matters of "training" merely. We may get lip service in regard to them, but to be genuinely operative they must be built up by a process of inner growth or education. To insure your children's getting the same emotional attitude toward things he must share the experiences with you. Dewey remarks that you may train a horse by feeding him but he "remains interested in food, not in the service he is rendering." "He is not a partner in a shared activity." "Were he to become a copartner, he would, in engaging in the conjoint activity, have the same interest in its accomplishment which others have." Education in standards must be brought about by making sure that the right emotional attitude is associated with them. And in this connection it will be well to remember that

moral enthusiasms, like aesthetic tastes, are "caught not taught." Our own example is the most potent agency.

Turn now to another aspect of the conflict between family and community standards—the present-day agitation about what the whole community of the younger generation are doing. To repudiate it wholesale as a mad-jazz age of irresponsibility and license, immodesty in dress and behavior is to shut yourself up to your own blindness and is a sure way to forfeit any influence for good upon your children. Why not try to understand something of the meaning of it all, seek the causes? There is much that is fallacious in our memory of the good old days, a sort of poetic fallacy which glorifies the simplicity and goodness of it all. You may refuse to have anything to do with the "goings-on" of today but your child cannot. It is his environment and the youth must venture forth into it. You see it in perspective; it is the one thing which he knows. You see it as a complexity in which there is a hodge-podge of doubtful values; he sees it as a whole. James's description of the baby's universe as a "booming, buzzing confusion" is more graphic than accurate. There is no confusion until some elements in the universe come into conflict with each other. If you can learn something of what seems to you the present booming-buzzing confusion by accompanying your children into it, you may be able to sort out for them some of the excellences, as over against the less worthwhile elements. It would be at least better than to have them go into it alone and accept it in its entirety. But there is also a possibility that you may find something of profit to yourself. You may find the variants from the old, which are seeds of a new progress.

How unreasoning and unreasonable we are. We criti-

cize our young people for their restless spirit of adventure and for their unwillingness to submit to the long discipline necessary for perfecting any technique for occupation or profession. We are terrified by their experimental attitude, their unafraid search for Reality, their lack of reverence for the things made sacred by tradition, and their disrespect of authority in general. They want life that is full of thrill, risk, danger. In other words life must be for them a "Great Adventure." Do you smile at the triteness of my climax? Then I have proved my point. We elders tell youth that "literature is a great adventure," that "business is the great adventure," that "religion is the great adventure." And you will find a host of other things that should be a great adventure if you pick up any magazine for a few minutes of reading. We are telling the young that adventure is all, and all is for adventure, and we are surprised that they are beginning to believe it.

Furthermore this is an age of science. We look every morning for the thrill of a new discovery which will perform this or that miracle overnight; and science has given us so many thrillers that we have a just basis for our expectation. But with the popularizing of science, a great human benefit, there is the unfortunate circumstance that so few of the reading public appreciate the long preparation in technique necessary before an investigator is equipped to enter upon his task, and, indeed, the lifetime of investigation that is often back of these revolutionary discoveries which seem to spring up over night, ready for the early morning edition of the paper. It is again the separation of process and product. It is small wonder that our young people cherish the secret belief that they can

achieve results by the alchemy of some short cut rather than by long and diligent application.

Again, the technique of science is experiment. Experiment is everywhere. Not the method of authority, but of experiment, is their heritage. They hear nothing else, they see nothing else, they know nothing else. What then do we expect?

My personal opinion, based upon too limited experience, perhaps, is that our young people are not out for complete license to live a life of satisfaction of instincts and wayward impulses. I am with those who have no fear that the Freudian doctrine in its popular form is influencing the pattern of their lives to any great extent. They are searching, they are experimenting, but they know what they are looking for—a purpose, or object in life, which shall make living worthwhile and life its own justification.

MOBILIZING THE HOME FOR MENTAL HEALTH

Margaret Gray Blanton, Child Psychologist, Minneapolis, Minnesota

The profession of parenthood is under fire. From every quarter comes criticism, and much of this criticism is destructive rather than constructive. Possibly this is because the study of these phases of human behavior is comparatively recent and relatively little data has been accumulated. It is easy to see that the home has often failed. It is more difficult to see wherein the home might be modified to make it a success. The parent sees the result of his failures and rushes to science for a panacea, thus in his turn postponing the day when the data—slowly accumulating—can be made available. There is no panacea for the problem of social adjustment because the problem itself is kinetic. It does not, in the vernacular, "stay put."

In the problem of behavior we must study the obvious causes because it is in the daily grind of obvious and undramatic situations that the habitual actions of the child are laid down. The patterns laid down in the performance of the commonplace control in all the situations of life. But the study of the obvious is dull work. It is easier to sit in an armchair and say what *should* be taking place in the mind of the child than laboriously to study and record it. There is nothing very thrilling about studying the way, for instance, in which the corner of the table is constructed with regard to its possible effect on the capac-

ity of the child in learning to walk. It is much more dramatic to state general principles and then to work in something that has a tremendous social appeal. But the students of human behavior must make something comparable to a microscopic study of the environment of the individual and his reaction to it. It is the work of the psychiatrist, the psychologist, and the pediatrician to study microscopically all the small details of living. A personality change is an important thing in the life of the individual, but it may be caused by nothing more dramatic than a tack in the shoe. It is the work of the dramatist to deal with broad generalizations and to present to society the beautiful fabric as it is eventually worked out. But the adult who has the training of a child in charge must learn to make haste slowly and to sift evidence.

This slow sifting of the environment for the causative gold has been retarded by another factor—the willingness of scientists and of parents to hide behind the old conception of "instinctive" behavior. It is certainly safer from the standpoint of the practical necessity of modifying behavior to assume that the human being has only one instinctive drive, a sort of urge to keep going. Whatever the exact classification may be in the actual process of training and retraining, this, it seems to me at least, is the only safe assumption, for it throws the whole burden of training for mental health on the environmental factors, which are after all the only modifiable ones.

This necessitates the elimination of continued hiding behind the word "heredity" also. Different nervous systems, to be sure, react in different ways to the same stimuli, but here again in the final analysis, training is the fac-

tor on which we may lay our hands. In the final analysis it does not matter what there is in the way of heredity because the child is here, and its heredity is, so to speak, unavoidable. Heredity is the problem of the eugenicist; the problem of the mental hygienist and of the parent is the individual in front of him. The person who is being dealt with is the child whose little mouth must be wiped off, or who is in the process of learning to eat spinach, or being taught to mind. It is the actual human being who must be mobilized for mental hygiene. And with the individual in front of you, the question is not some theoretic discussion of the instincts nor heredity, but "What are you going to do with him?"

Immediately someone says, "I have two children brought up under identical environment who are totally unlike. How can training or environment be the thing that determines this?" And we are brought back to see wherein the difference does lie. If there are as many as two children in the family, they constitute part of the environment for each other. Each constitutes part of his own environment. You yourself are part of your own environment. Think how much your own presence modifies your own home even for you.

In addition to this, there are certain emotional stresses that operate in regard to one child and not the other. I have in mind a case of a mother, very anxious for her first baby. She looked forward to its birth with great longing. Her father had just died. She saw in this child something to compensate for her tremendous loss. Inside of a year after this baby's birth, another child came and this second child, though desired, was not quite so eagerly longed for, and he was a little bit of a nuisance. The

mother's patience was not quite so inexhaustible. He had an unfortunate way of not eating his food quickly, and a number of little deviations in his behavior constituted a slight extra burden. Little by little he became a problem. It is obvious that the environment of these two children is not the same because of the difference in attitude of the mother and because this second child had always to contend with the older child which had been much desired, even excessively desired and looked forward to. When the mother says, "The first child minds like an angel, but I don't know what in the world is the matter with the second child," she is simply stating in other words that she is not conscious of the fact that her own emotional urges are affecting the children.

It is certainly never safe to be didactic in regard to rules for establishing mental health. At first glance all human beings appear more or less alike; one is conscious only of similarities; but the more closely one looks, the greater the divergence. Truly in behavior as in other fields "one man's food is another man's poison."

But certain things seem with fair consistency to produce bad results, and out of a large number of possible guiding rules, a few may be safely accepted for the better guiding of the child in the direction of mental health.

The child must be permitted to be an individual.— This, of course, does not mean that he must not be made to mind or that he must not be under a fairly rigorous discipline in accordance with the needs of the group, but he must be permitted to develop along the lines of his own emotional individuality. Even in this democratic age the child is seen with great frequency who is being molded by the father and the mother to carry on the intellectual am-

bitions of the family—the child whose life is being mapped out for him in accordance with the psychological need of the parents rather than his own. Many families of wealth or special talent are attempting to found dynasties. This is very commonly met with in universities. The boy whose father is an engineer will be sent to the university to become an engineer whether he wishes it or not. Young folks who have families in which one profession dominates are often offered on the altar of that particular profession, or in some families where wealth has been attained, great emphasis will be put on the boys in the family carrying on the business. If this effort at establishing a caste system wasted only a few years of the young person's life, it would not be so bad, but practically the drive from early childhood in the direction of this end thwarts the emotional development of the person. It is one of the commonest causes of a break in adjustment in the adolescent period.

The child must not be used to finish out the life of the parent.—"I wanted to study music all my life," a mother says, "but I didn't get to. What am I going to do about my daughter whom I want to be a musician and who won't practice?" The question is not, "Why will the girl not practice?" but "Why should she?" Why should anyone labor at an art unless he is driven by the inner necessity for expression? Certainly it is not sufficient that they be motivated by the desire of the parent nor even by ambition. The mother says, "Maybe she will be sorry when she grows up if she didn't practice." On the other hand, maybe she will be glad. Perhaps she would rather dig in a garden or ride a bicycle or paint pictures. Why not let

her find her own drive and not attempt to fulfil the unfulfilled desires of the parent?

To illustrate, there was once a very charming family, the father of which was a violinist of note. The elder brother was a violinist of note, and the eldest sister played the violin well. These three people died of influenza, leaving the mother and the younger girl. By the time this younger girl was old enough to hold the violin, it was understood that she must play the violin. Every drive in her environment said, "Violin." She was not fitted for the violin, did not want to play it. Strangely enough this perverse young girl liked to cook, liked to wash dishes, liked the orderly details of housework. She felt constructive and satisfied when she was engaged in housework. But there was nothing for her but to play the violin! Her hands could not be put in dish water nor in dirt or dust. They must be saved for handling the bow. She was tied to the violin until her seventeenth year when she had a severe emotional breakdown. She was liberated from the necessity for studying the violin and her mother's attitude with regard to her career changed, and now she is making a fairly successful adjustment on another basis.

The child must not be used as a peg on which the parents can hang an unsatisfied emotional life.—You know the apt but old story of the man who wrote the government with regard to the drafting of his son: "I don't want my boy to be taken in the draft. I raised him for my own use." This is an adequate attitude to have toward a mule but not toward a child, and yet it is fairly common. All of us are brought up with a sort of Cinderella belief in the happy ending. Apparently we come to adulthood

believing that in marriage we will find a bed of roses rather than the field of battle, as Stevenson has described it. Often the person finding that marriage does not offer a complete satisfaction for the yearnings of the individual turns to the child, expecting it somehow to complete what is lacking. Here again as in marriage the parent is told that it is legal and to be expected that she will find a complete outlet. The literature teems with sentimentality with regard to the emotions to be felt by the parent when at last the child lies in her arms. It is no wonder that she expects that all of the frustrations of life will be overcome by this magic influx of emotions. She is going to "throw herself into" this child, "wrap herself around" this child, experience enormous things in the emotional outpouring on this child; and if she does accomplish this, it is the way by which she may thwart the child in its own development. She learns eventually, if she is wise, that the only way that happiness can be accomplished by the individual is by living fully herself. What, after all, is the use of the individual in the natural scheme if to produce another is all? What is needed in the world is not an endless chain of occupants on the earth; it is human beings. Each has not only a right but also a duty to live individually. Reproduction does not in itself discharge all obligations to the race. A conviction of this on the part of the parent frees the child to live healthfully also. "I can't let my baby leave home," wails the mother of a last grown daughter. "Other children have gone and that's all right, but I can't give up my baby."

In kindergarten work for the re-education of nervous children, we often see this factor operating very early. We see children as early as three and four already the

victims of "nervous breakdown." A lovely boy of four was brought to the kindergarten one summer. He was precocious in size and intelligence, very alert and strong, dressed up in a little sailor suit with the name of a ship on his cap, his long, blond hair sweeping his shoulders. He was led into the kindergarten by both parents—one on each side, anxiously gripping his hand. This boy had come after ten years of childlessness on the part of the parents, and they were so afraid that something might happen to that little bit of future that they just watched him every single minute. They told me they thought there was something I ought to know about his behavior. I signified my willingness to listen, but they stressed it again. "This is something very special," they said, with much the tone and manner that they would have used if he had had hydrophobia. Finally brought to the point, they said, "He kicks." Hedged about by parental love and anxiety this boy was merely utilizing his one technique for conquering the environment.

It was necessary to teach this boy through a rational process that kicking was neither right nor wrong—it was simply a social inconvenience—and it was necessary to loosen from him as far as possible the octopus-like tentacles of his parents' emotions.

Children have a right to know the truth.—This is usually interpreted that they must know the truth about birth, and of course this is extremely important, but they must also know the other facts about life, about illness and unhappiness and death. There is a queer prevalent idea that the child can be protected from the facts of life. I do not know why it does not occur to people that children are continually shocked by the disappearance of

people from their midst. It is hard to realize why people should not always have felt that the child must be told something about this important matter. In this connection a mother once told me that she had told her child about death, and it had been extremely disturbing to the child, who henceforth refused to go to sleep until she was exhausted. It seems that what had happened was this: The child had come in after playing with a little girl whose mother had just died and had said, "Mother, what happens to you when they put you in the big, round hole in the ground?" The mother said, "Dearest, I will tell you all about it. They don't put you in a big, round hole; they put you in a long, narrow one. They fold your little hands and put a flower in them, and *it is just as though you are asleep*. Then they close the box and nail the top and put you in the ground." The child had the same reaction that you or I would have had. Premature burial is premature burial, whether the hole be long and narrow or big and round! Suppose every time you went to sleep you were not certain but what someone might come along and put a lily in your hand and put you in a nailed box and put you in the ground! It is very necessary in giving information of any sort to a child that we study the limitations of the child's experience. We have associative resources and knowledge on which to base conclusions, but it has not.

The child must be able to find security in constructive discipline.—The parent and all the adults in the child's environment must be willing to decide on what traits they wish to develop in the child and must work toward that end. A child cannot be "picked on" all morning in a way to make him afraid and fearful and pacifistic, and then be expected to be bold and brave and game in the afternoon

when it comes to a knock-down blow. There have to be fairly definite ideas of personality traits for which one wishes in the child, and the discipline must be aimed at their establishment.

The community is not adequately cared for medically in which it is not just as easy to have a child studied as an integrated human being as it is for him to be studied as a broken arch or a non-functioning lung. There must be places, child-guidance clinics, into which the child can be brought. It should be just as easy to have an effort made to "pluck out a rooted sorrow" as to pluck out a tonsil. The child-guidance clinic aims to study the conflict between the child and his environment and to help him to adjust. It should make an effort to explain to the child his environment—a service of which the child is often greatly in need. Very often indeed he does not understand what all of this pother of living is about. Why should he obey? Why should he study? He asks these questions, and he has a right to the best answer that can be given. The child must be helped to motivate himself if he is to have mental health, to find something inside himself which helps him attain the cultural level of our social organization rather than have it imposed on him from outside.

The second service of the child-guidance clinic must be the psychological rehabilitation of the family. Not all parents realize that very often their own conflicts with each other as human beings are fundamental factors in the child's behavior disorders, and this is true no matter how well the trouble is "concealed" from the child. Perhaps it would be better if these clinics were called family-

guidance clinics because that would be nearer the truth as regards the technique necessarily used. The clinics should, if possible, help the families, especially the mother, to discover more satisfactory social outlets.

It seems to me that only the most superficial observation justifies the statement that parents neglect their children and are not interested in them. We at least do not meet with the parent of his type. On the contrary, the parents with whom we come in contact are overanxious, disturbed, and full of the feeling that through lack of information they are not doing the best for their child that is possible.

On the whole, the thing that seems most needed by parents is a bit of optimism. I don't mean "Pollyanna," for that, of course, is infantilism, not optimism. Pessimism, on the other hand, is just as destructive; it is unsublimated adolescence. It seems to me that we are badly in need of the capacity to take ourselves as a civilization with just a grain of salt. The world has rocked along for a good long time, and it isn't likely to wabble on its hinges because you or I or the children in our care cannot accomplish as individuals some definite thing. Perhaps after all what is most needed is a sense of humor and perspective.

HEALTH

THE NEED OF CONTINUOUS HEALTH SUPERVISION

Dr. Caroline Hedger, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund

It seems to me that trying to prove the need of continuous health supervision is like trying to prove that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, because, as a matter of fact, we all know that we have not health, and we all know the loss from lack of health and the need of health, and we know that some way this program of health has to be gotten across, and there seems no other way but to pay attention to it, which is really, fundamentally, health supervision.

I am not going to try to prove that we need health supervision to this audience. There is not a person in this audience who does not know it. I am going to try to speak a little bit of the weak spots in this line of health supervision, and what we can do to strengthen it.

Perhaps we ought, in the beginning, to understand each other, with a definition of what health supervision is. I am going to begin with a definition of what it is not. One spring day some years ago a medical friend of mine who had married a little bit late, and achieved a very cherished child, came to visit me. It was a nice, warm, sunshiny morning, so we sat out on the front step and the child happened to sneeze. My friend had a large black bag with her, such as women then carried. She dived down into this bag and brought out something and rubbed it on the child's forehead. Then she dived down into the bag again and brought out something which she put up

the child's nose, and the third time, to my surprise, she went into the capacious bag and brought out something that she put on the child's tongue. I have often wondered how that child came to maturity under the conditions under which she was being cared for. Do not for a moment imagine that that was health supervision. That was the picture of an old hen with one chick.

This health supervision that I want to speak to you about is a positive program. It is not a program of fear and anxiety. It is a co-operative program. It can be done alone, in my belief, by no one of the factors that surround the child, and it has to be done from many angles.

At the moment it seems to me that the greatest stress in this supervision of health falls upon the parents, the physicians, and the psychologist, with the schools and the organized health forces of the community running a close second, and being perhaps more intimately concerned with prevention of injury.

What is this health supervision? Where are we taking the child? We are not taking this child to health as an end; we are not building Greek athletes, nor especially prize-winning children for the county fair. Nor are we in the last analysis necessarily building a winning football team. We are bringing that child through to its most perfect growth; its thoroughgoing development in many lines; its usefulness; its satisfaction; and in addition to these aims of any health program, we have to have a time element in this dealing with the child. That child has to be built for the long haul. It cannot be built for this grade, or this day, or this year, or this achievement. It is for the long haul, the difficult long haul of citizenship.

There came this February an illustration of one of

the first needs of health supervision in the February 6 number of the *Journal of the American Medical Association,* to which I should like to call your attention, in which is a careful and scientific study of 1,000 maternal deaths. You will find there food for a great deal of thought in health supervision.

Fifty-eight per cent of these one thousand dead mothers died of childbed fever, a preventable disease; of convulsions, a largely preventable disease; and of hemorrhage, usually considered a preventable disease. Thirty-nine per cent of these one thousand dead mothers had had no health supervision whatever through pregnancy, and 89 per cent of these dead mothers had had no adequate prenatal care.

There is a point for health supervision.

These authors also state that neomortality, that is, the mortality of the little newborn baby (and as you know, the first week of life is the most dangerous), in infants can be cut down, apparently as the result of health supervision, about 50 per cent. In such a program of health supervision as is indicated by this need, there can be put in many by-products. For instance, we could have the possibility of teaching methods of preserving breast-feeding for the normal period of nine months. We could have various problems of care of the infant taught at the same time. That would make it a very profitable form of health supervision, besides the actual saving of maternal and infant life.

The field of infant health is now at a point where we can see the results of health supervision. Our own low death-rate, seventy-four per thousand, here in Chicago is due to the fine work of our organized health forces, our

health department, our Infant Welfare Society, and the pediatricians of high standards and training who have altered some of the conditions around the child, so that we have a lower death-rate. And they have, in addition, assisted the mother in the supervision that has had a tremendous influence upon the life and well-being of other infants. But beyond infancy the trail is a bit harder, and it is perfectly logical, because the child's growth is less spectacular, he grows more slowly, his death-rate is lower, and parents have not until very recently had any keen idea of the relation of these preschool children, for instance, to future nutritional health.

In nutritional work it is extremely interesting to get this absence of interest in this preschool age. You bring one of these poor little malnourished children up in school, and you say to the mother, "Has this child always been skinny?" "Oh, no, he was a nice baby; he weighed seven and a half, or eight pounds." And you say, "How long has he been skinny?" "Well, when he began to run around he began to get skinny, and he has been skinny ever since," and the mother apparently has never correlated that lack of good nutrition in the child with that accident of nutrition at the early age.

There are many problems. There is the relation of the health of this preschool child to organic health later, because of the incidents of focal infections; there is the problem of resistance, which we know very little about, but which is one of the things to which we must look in the future.

We have not seen, in spite of this fine presentation this morning, and do not yet see as a mass, the relationship of early emotional states to later nervous levels. This

literature is developing, and the behavior clinic is dealing with children who show some problems in behavior.

Of course that is the first step, and in time it will get its message in to the people who are around the little child, so that there will be a program of prevention, because it is quite a costly and troublesome thing to iron some of these queer kinks out of these little personalities and put in fresh kinks that run in the right direction. It is very much cheaper and easier and more efficacious to get the right kink into that little personality first.

The positive health building of the school child only now appears above the horizon. Our work so far has been largely corrective, which is necessary. That child's defects have to be dealt with to clear the field for positive health. We have as yet hardly gotten into the promotion of good posture by well fitted, and frequently fitted, seats. We shall awake to the fact that, again, it is easier to keep the child's back straight than to straighten it. We have not got that far yet. We have as yet hardly seized upon the fundamental use of athletics as health-builders in contradistinction to the winning team. And we have almost left untouched the relationship of the various school stresses of the child's life—for instance, examinations. They are stresses that affect the mental and physical health of the child. Maybe you think I am drawing a long bow when I think, or speak, of examinations as the stress of the school child. I wish you could see a class of little children who are trying to be built up; and see what happens to them on examination week, if you think that thing is free from stress and strain. As a matter of fact, maybe there have to be examinations, maybe we have to get the child so he can stand examinations. I am not an educator,

I do not know that, but I am sure that we have no clear vision as yet of the problem of positive health in the child in relation to these other things of the school that we take so as a matter of course. All this is to be a thing of the future, a thing of organizations like this one that give thoroughgoing and continued study to our problems.

Closely allied to any plan of health supervision is, of course, the content of public health education in the school. It is as yet entirely unsolved, though there are people in this room who are spending their days at it, and doubtless we shall have it. I, of course, am not fitted to speak on the content of health education for children, but I am sure of some things that should not be, and I want to recount something that happened to me in a little school in Iowa some years ago that will illustrate some of my points.

This school had won a banner for some sort of achievement—I believe along health lines. I was to meet the P.T.A., and it was a great day, and the school felt that it wanted to do its share in this festivity, so they had taken a row of these little steps, little children, seven, eight, and nine years old, and had taught them to speak a little piece about tuberculosis, and these little things said their piece about tuberculosis.

I received a great deal of information that I don't usually carry with me on that day. I learned then, and have never forgotten since, because I was told at least ten times that Koch found the tubercle bacillus in 1882. I think my information is still correct. I was told something, I believe, about the open window. I was not given by one of those little children the fact that good nutrition and right living makes us resistant to that little plant that

we all meet every day, but I was told one fact that has stuck, among the other information, about the tubercle bacillus—every single one of these little steps said, like a little parrot, "It multiplies by dividing." So it does, but what does that mean in our young lives, and what did it mean to those children. It means absolutely nothing. They do not multiply by dividing, they multiply by multiplying, and they divide by dividing.

That little experience has made me think a great deal about the field of health education which follows directly after health supervision, and I am sure that we must not teach fear. I am sure that we must not teach disease. I am sure that we must teach a positive psychology of right living that will build resistance and make us face up toward the sunshine and forget the germs that perhaps are behind.

What are the aims of health supervision? What can we set as a reasonable end of health supervision? Growth! Continuous and regular growth in the child. It is a very complex thing, with many factors. Heredity! How much we do not know. There is a Kentucky woman in this room who gave me a fact about growth that has made me very doubtful about hereditary factors in growth. She told me her father was a horse-breeder, and that he had to import his Shetland ponies about every three generations because they grew up on the lime and blue grass of Kentucky, and grew into horses. That has thrown a little doubt into my mind about hereditary factors of growth, but of course we do not know.

Glandular factors in growth are only beginning to be elaborated by men like McCarrison who says that on diet depends glandular secretion; and we medical people be-

lieve that glandular secretion has a lot to do with growth. If we really get interested in growth we will have to take counsel with our friends who know about diet very carefully. It is part of our health supervision, and of course there are a great many of us to whom it seems as if nutrition itself had something to do with growth. It is largely an unexplored field, but I believe that one aim of health supervision is the optimum growth of the child, to see that he keeps growing and that nothing happens to him to prevent that growth.

Nutrition seems to me a perfectly normal aim of health supervision, sufficient for growth, sufficient to make the income necessary for the child. Certainly the nutrition of the child has to do with one of the fundamentals of health in the child which is the highest possible interest, and I am sure that nutrition has something to do with that great problem which is one of the major themes of this convention, and that is the nervous balance in resulting behavior. This nervous balance, again, relates to glandular secretion, nutritional values, and environments, and this makes a sort of an interwoven thing, as Dr. Abt says: you cannot separate out any one thing.

These common denominators of nutrition—glandular secretion and nervous balance—make an all-round health supervision an absolute necessity. And of course, in all this aim of health supervision must be considered the conservation of the reproductive life of the child.

This all-round and interdependent development demands a co-operative program in health supervision. In my judgment no one person can do it alone. The parent, the physician, the psychologist, and the educator have to make a close corporation around that child, and at the

moment, I believe the thing that they all need most is the ideal of a well child. I believe they ought to see that child as a vital, growing thing, a beautiful thing, a thing developing into a social being, a flexible body, and an adjustable nervous system, a serviceable unit of the future.

Undoubtedly we have not had enough discontent with the child as he exists today. If we each one of us here went into our schools and looked over our children we would see in those schools a mass of material with which we should be discontented, and which we should little by little build or supervise into a more efficient and beautiful childhood.

The parent has to be discontented with his own child, if it is not the best. That is very hard—the child is so close to us and so precious to us. It is terribly hard to be discontented with our own child, but, honestly, wouldn't you love him just as well if he looked like something human and had some meat on him? I cannot see but what you would be just as fond of him, and somehow or other, you have got to get that child off far enough so that you can see whether you have the best, and this conference is one effort in that direction. I believe that in the whole program of the future the parent especially must keep clearly in mind the fact that the physical is the basis of the other. That is not materialism. That is just ordinary observation. You do not get the most perfect shining of your spirit, and you do not get the most perfect functioning of your mental organ unless there is balance in that body, and you especially do not get the lasting quality in the child.

I believe that the parent must set for himself standards of physical health supervision, with the aid of peo-

ple who know, the medical profession. Perhaps the parent can be discontented, but he cannot solve the physical problems of the child—only the physician, only the psychologist, only the trained person can do that.

Our physicians and our psychologists have to come in to this partnership on the basis of giving all of us who are interested in the child the capital of the child with which we have to work. We doctors and teachers would not think of willingly and knowingly injuring a child, and yet we know so little of the actual capital of that child, and we can so easily go over, in some way, the threshold that makes for normal health and normal development.

This means, of course, far more thorough work than the community has ever done with the child, and yet I have a dream of a co-operation for the child in the school, perhaps, in which all these skilled people set down in black and white the kind of material we have to deal with. Is this child A1 mentally and physically in a hereditary way? If so, he can take a hard program. Is he B3 mentally or physically, or both? If so, then that load has to be adjusted.

Of course the health supervision in the school means the drawing-out of the powers of that individual child, whatever they may be—any vocational, or educational, or especial line that can be discovered. Of course we are only at the threshold of a supervision that would put that child into the right job, and you heard what happens to children in the wrong job this morning. This health supervision relates very closely to that thing that was given you this morning—getting the round peg into a round hole and the square peg into a square hole. You cannot have

health aside from that in the highest terms, but it seems to me that in this search for the real field of a child's activity, we have to clearly say to ourselves, "Here, we are going to find out, if we can, what the capital of this child is; we are going to develop his capabilities so far as in us lies, but the one thing we are not going to do is to injure that material, because we have to keep in mind this long haul. We cannot take out of that child in educational, cultural, social, athletic ways, the nutrition and the nervous balance that is going to last that child through the long haul, and through a long life."

Of course the field of the adolescent has not been touched. We know very little about it. We have done no health work in the adolescent field. We are putting very heavy stresses on that terminal period of development, and health supervision of the adolescent is a thing of the future. I wish to say that I believe continuous health supervision before and after birth is a necessity, that it has to be along positive lines. It has to be accompanied by positive health education, by education of parents, which this conference represents, and it has to be definitely on the line of the individual child and his usefulness to the future.

A NEW DISCOVERY OF AN OLD POWER—SUNLIGHT

Dr. Martha M. Eliot, Director of Child Hygiene Division, Department of Labor (co-operating with Children's Bureau on Research, New Haven, Connecticut)

The treatment of disease with sunlight, known today as heliotherapy, is as old as the science of medicine, but the scientific use of sunlight for certain forms of tuberculosis and for rickets is as new as the twentieth century. If we look into historical medical literature we find, now and then, references to sun baths for the sick, but we find almost no mention of prevention of disease with sunlight. On the Island of Cos in about the year 400 B.C. Hippocrates, the father of medicine, advised sun baths and built a temple to Aesculapius, the god of medicine, to serve as a solarium for his patients. From the time of Hippocrates until the beginning of the Dark Ages, Greek and Roman physicians continued to recommend sun baths for the cure of disease. In modern times heliotherapy has been practiced more or less in France since the end of the eighteenth century. The first specific use of sunlight for the treatment of tuberculosis was made by the physicians of Lyons about 1840, but it was not put on a sound scientific basis until 1903 when Rollier opened his clinic in Switzerland. Today many hundreds of children and adults with bone and gland tuberculosis go to Switzerland to be treated with sun baths. After many years of experience Rollier has established a system of graduated sun baths which have as their ultimate goal thorough pigmentation

of the skin of the whole body and not sunburn. The altitude in Switzerland insures coolness of the air as well as great intensity of sunlight. The heat of the sun is useful in heliotherapy only in the winter and must be avoided at midday in summer even in the mountains. The best heliotherapy consists of light baths and not of heat baths, and may be practiced at any altitude or in any place where the sunlight is clear. This method of treating tuberculosis became so successful in Rollier's clinic that it has been imitated in all parts of Europe and this country. Switzerland is no longer the only place where tuberculous children may be seen playing naked in the sun or lying on outdoor sun porches. In many parts of this country, whether at the seashore or in the mountains, just such scenes are common today.

Rollier did not limit his use of sunlight to treatment of tuberculosis. In 1910 a school was opened under his supervision where the influence of sunlight in the prevention of tuberculosis could be demonstrated. That this "school in the sun" was a success is shown by the ever increasing number of so-called preventoria which are springing up in this country for children known to have been exposed to tuberculosis. If sunlight is good for the cure of tuberculosis in older children, it is also certainly good for its prevention in younger ones. In 1916 a small volume was published in France by Dr. G. Léo urging the use of heliotherapy for the prevention of tuberculosis in infancy.[1] Simple straightforward directions were given for sun baths for babies, but apparently they attracted

[1] Gontraud Léo, *Les tout-petits arc soleil; l'hygiène par l'héliothèrapie dans la première enfance.* Paris: A. Maloine et fils, 1916.

little attention either in Europe or in this country. In recommending heliotherapy for infants, Léo thought only of its value in preventing tuberculosis. Little did he realize that in so doing he was advising a procedure which would also prevent another and more common disease of infancy.

To many people today heliotherapy implies only the cure or prevention of tuberculosis. Our conception, however, of the value of heliotherapy must become wider and the cure and prevention of rickets as well as that of tuberculosis be included in it. Recent medical investigation has shown that sunlight has an absolutely specific effect on the development and cure of rickets and is indispensable for the normal growth of infants. Rickets as a chronic nutritional disturbance has been known to physicians for over 250 years, but the importance of sunlight in its cure and prevention has only been known definitely for the past seven years. The true value of sunlight in relation to rickets was first suggested by an Englishman in 1890 and reiterated in 1912 by a French investigator, but actual proof of its value was not obtained until 1919 when X-ray photographs of the bones demonstrated that rickets could be cured by ultra-violet radiations. Two years later (1921), investigators showed that cure could be brought about by sunlight alone.

For over a century and a half cod-liver oil has been known to exert a favorable influence in rickets. Proof that cod-liver oil had a specific curative action in rickets, apparently similar to that of sunlight, was obtained in this country in 1921 and the cure demonstrated by X-ray photographs of the bones of rachitic children. As a result of even more recent experiments it is probable that the action of sunlight and cod-liver oil in the cure of rickets

is the same and that the oil from the liver of the cod fish has acquired its antirachitic power from the sunlight passing through the water to the fish or to the plants eaten by the fish. It has been definitely shown that vegetable oils, milk, green vegetables, and grains may also acquire this antirachitic power if treated with ultra-violet radiation. When cod-liver oil is ingested by the infant, radiant energy is probably somehow liberated, to regulate metabolism and cure or prevent rickets. Thus cod-liver oil may truly be called "bottled sunshine."

Sunlight, as we see it, is only a very small part of the radiations given off from the sun. When the visible light from the sun passes through a prism it is broken up into its component parts to form the well-known spectrum of colors, red, orange, yellow, green, blue, and violet. Beyond each end of this visible spectrum there are invisible radiations at the red end, the heat waves, at the violet end, the ultra-violet rays. The ultra-violet radiations are few in number compared to the heat and visible light, but it is these rays which are of such importance to animal life, destroying bacteria, stimulating the healing process in tuberculosis, and preventing or healing rickets. The intensity of these ultra-violet radiations as they reach the earth's surface varies greatly with the season of the year and with the condition of the atmosphere. In the north temperate zone the intensity is greatest when the sun has reached the most northern point in its circuit, that is about June 21, and least when the sun has reached the most southern point, December 21. During the day it has been shown that the intensity is greatest between ten and two o'clock. If the day is cloudy or if there is smoke or dust in the atmosphere, the intensity of the radiation is greatly

diminished. Ultra-violet radiation is less, therefore, in congested smoky cities than in the open country. When the radiations from the sun pass through solid substances certain rays are filtered out. Black silk, for instance, will permit the passage of heat rays, but is opaque to the visible and ultra-violet rays. Window glass permits the passage of visible rays and heat rays but is opaque to the ultra-violet rays. By dressing ourselves in heavy clothing and by living behind glass windows we are depriving ourselves effectually of most of these valuable ultra-violet radiations. It is only when the rays strike directly on the bare skin that they can be absorbed by the body. Pigmentation of the skin is the evidence that the body is reacting to the radiations. Ultra-violet radiations of great intensity may be produced artificially by a mercury vapor quartz lamp or carbon arc lamp and may be used therapeutically as sunlight is used, though in smaller doses.

The practical use of sunlight in the treatment of tuberculosis has today been very well established, and is also being very generally recommended as a prophylactic measure for the so-called pre-tuberculous child or child who has been exposed to tuberculosis. The therapeutic use of both sunlight and artificial ultra-violet light for the child with severe rickets is now well recognized, but the use of sunlight as a preventive measure in infancy not only for tuberculosis, but more important still for rickets, has been overlooked until the last few years. Even now sun baths for babies are looked upon askance, and the real need for them is not appreciated. Complete or even partial sun baths are reserved for those children who are unfortunate enough to have become diseased. Little thought has been given to preventing these diseases when

the child is still an infant. The need to prevent tuberculosis among young infants and young children is not generally recognized. The death-rate from tuberculosis at this age is too high and the number of children who acquire the disease before their third year too great. Sun baths may help the child build up resistance to tuberculosis by preventing many of the common respiratory infections, by helping to improve nutrition and muscular development, and, perhaps, by preventing rickets.

The need to prevent rickets among young infants cannot be emphasized too much. In the central and northern states rickets in a greater or less degree is a nearly universal condition among young infants, whether breast or artificially fed. Approximately one-third of all city children show either moderate or severe deformities of rickets. It is true that the most severe cases are found among the dark-skinned races, but mild and moderate degrees of the disease occur among the fair-skinned races to an extent not realized until recently when the X-ray has been used to help make the diagnosis. If these fair-skinned infants receive antirachitic treatment, that is, if they are taken outdoors into the direct sunlight and if they are given the antirachitic factor in cod-liver oil, the mild degree of rickets demonstrable by X-ray will not develop into a more severe degree. Dark-skinned infants probably need longer exposure to the sunlight and perhaps larger doses of cod-liver oil to attain the same degree of control of rickets as fair-skinned infants. This may be due to the fact that the natural pigmentation of their skin, acquired as protection from the intense sunlight of the south, overprotects them from the northern sunlight. If rickets is not allowed to advance beyond a slight de-

gree there are probably few if any bad results. It is the rickets which is allowed to go untreated which carries deformities in its wake and with which anemia, bronchitis, pneumonia, and sometimes convulsions are associated. Bony deformities of the extremities such as bow legs, severe knock-knees, and flat foot are to be deprecated because they interfere with the correct use of the body; bony deformities of the chest are frequently associated with chronic bronchitis and recurring pneumonia; bony deformities of the pelvic bones are responsible for a large proportion of difficult and operative deliveries for women in child birth, to say nothing of injuries to the infant during such difficult delivery. A large percentage of convulsions of infants under one year of age is due to tetany, a condition associated with rickets. Babies with rickets are particularly prone to respiratory infections, to anemia, to malnutrition. If rickets can be controlled from its very incipiency in the first months of life these untoward results will be avoided.

The institution of sun baths for babies and young children in any American community is not easy because tradition and convention have been opposed to them for many generations. Climatic conditions in many parts of this country make warm clothing a necessity during the winter season. During the spring, summer, and fall, however, babies and little children wear much more clothing than is necessary. One has only to take off a baby's or a little child's clothes and watch him play in the sun to know that it is convention and not instinct which demands clothes at this age. Tradition also says that sunlight may injure a baby's eyes. If the baby's face is turned so that the eyes look away from the sun or if the older child

wears a cotton shade hat in hot weather, the eyes will not be injured. Old traditions and conventions are hard to break. New traditions and conventions must be established by small groups, and slowly the rest of the community will follow.

The technique of the sun bath will vary somewhat according to locality, climate, season, weather, and facilities in the home. Sunlight is free to all and sun baths can be given to all babies at some season of the year. Southern babies can have outdoor sun baths the year around. Northern babies are less fortunate, but even in our climate partial sun baths can be given nearly all the year and complete sun baths all the summer months. In practically all parts of the United States, preliminary outdoor sun baths can be started by the first of March. A corner of the yard or porch should be selected where the morning sun shines warmly, but where the child will be protected from the wind. Here the baby's hands and face and head may be exposed to the sun for varying lengths of time beginning with five or ten or even fifteen minutes and increasing gradually during the month as the sun gets warmer. If the baby is turned first on one side and then on the other, both cheeks may be exposed without injury to the eyes. The hands may be exposed, at first, one at a time, later both together. The bonnet may be pushed daily further back until the whole head is exposed. In many parts of the country these preliminary sun baths may be started in February or even January. During these sun baths in early spring, sunburn need not be feared because the intensity of the sunlight is not yet very great. Later in the season shorter exposures may be necessary at first.

As the spring days get warmer, usually by the first of April, the area of the skin exposed to the sun may be increased by rolling up the sleeves to the elbow, for five or ten minutes. Each week thereafter the duration of the sun bath on head and arms may be increased five or ten minutes, the amount depending on the rapidity with which pigmentation takes place. Early in April, depending somewhat on the climate or weather, the stockings may be taken off, at first one at a time, later both together, for five or ten minutes each, thus exposing the leg and knee to the sun. The period of exposure of the legs must increase five or ten minutes weekly thereafter. By approximately the middle of May, when the baby's arms and legs have become accustomed to the sun baths and are tanned, more of the body can be exposed. The jacket and dress may be taken off for five minutes each day for a week, thus exposing the shoulders and neck as well as the arms and legs. As with the arms and legs the period of exposure of the neck and shoulders should increase five to ten minutes each week. By the end of May the sun bath may be given with all clothes off except the band and diaper, and by the first or second week of June the baby may receive complete sun baths with no clothing. Care must be taken to gradually accustom each new part of the skin to the sunlight by starting with five-minute exposure and increasing by five or ten minute amounts each week. By the first of June the face, head, arms, and legs may be exposed for approximately an hour, whereas the complete sun bath including the trunk will only last five or ten minutes. By the end of June, however, the complete sun bath may be given for from one-half to a whole hour.

Pigmentation of the skin and not sunburn is the end

for which to strive in giving sun baths to babies. No absolute rule can be laid down as to how long this will take. The baby with fair skin will require shorter exposures at first in order to avoid sunburn, but may be given more frequent sun baths, possibly twice or even three times a day in order to hasten pigmentation. The baby with dark hair and dark skin will pigment more rapidly and longer exposures can be safely given. Negro babies may have twice as long exposures as white babies. Older children can usually have longer initial exposures than young babies. A general schedule such as this may be followed fairly closely, but no schedule will serve for all babies and common sense must be used at all times to avoid sunburn.

During the spring months sun baths are best given between ten and one, but during the hot summer months they should be given earlier in the morning between eight and ten. Once the child's body has become well tanned he can play in the sun several hours, provided he wears a light cotton shade hat. During the extreme heat of July and August it is better that the child should play in the shade between ten and three. A child accustomed to complete sun baths in the summer can continue them late into the fall and can have partial sun baths on all sunny days in the winter. Outdoor sun baths may be started as described at any time during the spring, summer, or fall, but the duration of these initial exposures must depend on the season, those of the spring and fall being longer than those of July and August.

In the northern states during the winter months from November to March it is often difficult to give outdoor sun baths to very young babies. The heat of the sunlight which we would so gladly dispense with in July and Aug-

ust must be used to its greatest extent in winter and spring. It has been found that the temperature in winter may be forty or more degrees higher in the direct sunlight in a place protected from the wind than in the shade. Babies born in the winter should sleep as often as possible outdoors in the sun during the morning nap and the sun be allowed to shine on the cheeks and face. During these months, moreover, partial sun baths may be given to babies indoors lying inside an open sunny window. The window may be opened at the top or at the bottom, but it is important that the baby lie in the patch of sunlight which has come through the open space. During the indoor sun bath it is best to close the doors of the room to avoid drafts. The same technique may be used for the indoor sun bath as for the outdoor. Babies who have become accustomed to indoor sun baths in winter can begin outdoor sun baths in February or March.

Sun baths need not be limited to babies. They should be continued throughout the early years of childhood. The more sunlight little children can receive the better will they withstand colds, infections, and contagious diseases. During the summer, many children are taken to the seashore or to the country where sun baths are easily given. On the beach wearing a sleeveless low neck bathing suit, or better still, a pair of bathing trunks, a little child can receive an ideal sun bath. After his body is once well tanned he can play several hours a day on the beach. In the country, however, or in the city, no one thinks of dressing a child in a bathing suit when he is playing in the fields or in the back yard. A pair of bathing trunks will serve as well for a sun bath in the country or in the city back yard as for a salt water bath at the sea or a fresh

water bath at the lake. Sun bathing is much more important than sea bathing or lake bathing, and has the great advantage of being everywhere accessible in summer. Sun bathing suits should allow as much skin as possible to be exposed and may consist of a thin, short, sleeveless, low-necked slip or romper or a simple set of sleeveless cotton underwear which will leave the arms and legs and neck bare. During the summer, clothes for children should be sleeveless and cut low in the neck. Bare legs and sandals should be the fashion from May until October, and children should vie with one another as to which one gets the best coat of tan. Dr. Saleeby of London, a great advocate of sunshine for children, urges us in his excellent book on *Sunlight and Health*[2] not to let fashion dominate our choice of children's clothes.

Though heliotherapy is as old as mankind, its scientific application is almost as new as the century in which we live. Helio-prevention, if I may use a new word, is still more recent. Much of the success and popularity of sun baths will depend upon the enthusiasm with which small groups of parents welcome them for their children. All well children, whether strong or delicate, will benefit from sun baths properly regulated. If a child is not well, sun baths should be undertaken only under the direction of a physician, but in many instances better health will be coincident with the beginning of sun baths. Overenthusiasm in the use of sunlight must be avoided. Benefit is received even during the slow preparatory period when the skin is beginning to pigment. Harm may be done by too much haste. The rules of the game are as follows:

[2] C. W. Saleeby, M. D., *Sunlight and Health.* London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1923.

First, to progress slowly, but regularly, starting with a few minutes and working up to two or three hours.

Second, to watch for pigmentation of the skin, avoiding sunburn, and to increase the length of sun bath accordingly.

Third, to expose the arms and legs first and the body afterwards.

Fourth, to use the morning sunlight of spring, summer, and fall, and all the available sunlight of winter. In summer the head should be protected from the heat in the middle of the day.

If these general rules are followed, sun baths may be given to children of any age.

THE TIRED CHILD—RECOGNITION AND MANAGEMENT

Dr. Max Seham, Professor of Pediatrics,
University of Minnesota

Fatigue is a condition much talked about and little understood. It is most intimately related with everyday life. All of us parents, teachers, industrial workers, and children suffer from it or are affected by it at some time or other, for short periods or for long. It is a sign of normal health, yet also a symptom of disease. It is varied in its manifestations, yet simple of recognition. Yet as common as it is, and as long as we have known about it, the nature of fatigue is still obscure.

For fifty years the subject of fatigue has been studied in the laboratory by physiologists; for twenty years psychologists have attempted to produce artificial fatigue in the normal individual. More recently industrial fatigue has attracted the attention of investigators, but to date, as far as I know, there has been no comprehensive study of chronic fatigue in the school child. Yet there is no problem, so it seems to me, that is more closely associated with the health and happiness of the school child than the problem of chronic fatigue.

How can we learn about chronic fatigue? When we first started to investigate this subject, when we first attempted to classify children on the basis of their efficiency for work, we naturally used the method which then was in vogue, namely, the so-called physiologic-psychological tests. We first used the so-called physical tests and then

the psychological tests, and finally a combination of the two. You probably know what these tests are. We found one definite and constant factor, namely, that there exists such a great individual variation in one and the same child at different times of performance, that motivation plays such a great rôle in the output of work that these tests, these so-called "objective" tests, cannot be used for determining either the amount or the degree of fatigue.

Let me cite two examples. First, a child, while riding a stationary bicycle, will do 10,000 footpounds at one sitting and at another sitting, on the same day, about 30,000 footpounds! Which is the normal standard for this child? Which is his average physical capacity, 10,000 or 30,000 footpounds? The same is true, if one attempts to interpret some of the psychological tests—those tests that the psychologists have used a great deal. In the foot balance test a child will be able to balance himself on the ball of his foot for three minutes; a minute later he will balance himself for, perhaps, ten minutes. Which is the average? Which is normal for that particular child?

On the basis of our work, I think I am justified in concluding that to date there is no single objective psychophysiologic test which can be used to determine either the amount or the degree of fatigue. What, then, can we use? How can we discover, first of all, the landmarks of fatigue, and how can we classify children on the basis of efficiency?

With no test to fall back on we were compelled to study the children as individual machines by means of their daily reactions to their activities. That is, we were compelled to inquire into the lives of the children, into their abilities and their disabilities, into their points of

view, their relationship to their environment, and their physical, mental, and emotional activity. To do this, we devised certain questionnaires. We used six different sets of questionnaires.

The first was a questionnaire of health habits to be answered by the child; the second a corroborating questionnaire of health habits, to be answered by the mother; the third a questionnaire of general efficiency to be answered by the child; fourth, a questionnaire of efficiency similar to the one for the child, answered by the mother; fifth, a questionnaire of efficiency to be answered by the room teacher; and sixth, a questionnaire of efficiency to be answered by the gymnasium teacher.

You see, what we were aiming at through these questions, which covered about 260 different points, was first to learn something more about the child than the traditional examination of children reveals. Traditional medicine speaks of an enlarged heart, of a broken leg or arm, of diseased and infected tonsils, but it does not speak of the function of the body as a whole, of the combined working effects of all the organs and systems; nor does it concern itself, to any great extent, with habits of living as a possible cause of disease.

Secondly, we aimed to find a contrast in the efficiency and the health habits of normal children and those who are chronically subefficient.

The answers to the questions revealed to us the following points: First, there is no such thing as a perfect child. We had no child whose questionnaire was 100 per cent normal. I might say in passing that for grading we used a key, which was partly arbitrary, based upon a schedule of rational habits devised by us; on the other

hand, it was based on a careful study of abnormal signs and symptoms. Each answer denoting an inadequate health habit or an abnormal sign of efficiency was marked with a check. In the answers of normal children we found on an average five inadequate health habits as against ten in abnormal children. Again, the health habits, as answered by the mother, ran four for normal and eight for abnormal children.

In other words, the children who are suffering from chronic fatigue and chronic subefficiency had twice as many inadequate health habits as those whom we diagnosed normal children. This, I think, indicates that habits of living play a rôle in the production of fatigue.

In the questionnaire of efficiency, answered by the child, we found five unfavorable signs in the normal children as compared to fourteen in abnormal children, an increase of over 100 per cent. The mother's answers showed eight unfavorable for the normal as against seventeen for the abnormal, and those of the room teacher nine as against twenty-one in abnormal children, about two and a half times as high.

So much for the statistical side of our study. I think that our findings proved the value of the questionnaire method. Of course, it is true that the questionnaire method has its pitfalls—if the questions are not asked in a specific, direct, concrete and objective way, one will receive inaccurate answers.

First, the specificity of questions: in ascertaining certain health habits, as for instance, if one asks a child how much candy he eats, he may answer little or much. But if one asks him how many pieces of candy he eats daily, his own interpretation of what is much or little is excluded.

Secondly, questions must be objective and not suggestive: the voice of the examiner and the general attitude that he has toward the child will affect the child's answers. If a child suspects that he is to answer in a certain way, he will, naturally, answer that way. For instance, if a physician asks: "Don't you eat vegetables?" Very naturally the child will say, "Yes." But if you ask the child to write down, without helping him, "What did you eat for your last three suppers?" you are more likely to get accurate answers. That, of course, is a very important point, and questionnaires are of no value unless the psychology in the asking on the part of the examiner has been eliminated as much as possible.

We were enabled to determine the following facts from these questionnaires: Chronic fatigue or, if I may use a more practical, less ambiguous term, chronic subefficiency is manifested in four ways: (1) by what we call feelings of fatigue, that is, the complaints of the child of headaches, backaches, pain in the legs, soreness in the muscles, a feeling of burning in the muscles, and so forth; (2) by a decrease in the individual's average mental working capacity as attested to by the work he does in school, as revealed in his report card and by the questionnaire answered by the room teacher; (3) a decrease in the physical strength and endurance of the child, as attested to by his own questionnaire and the teachers' and parents' observations of the child during physical activity; and (4) by the emotional reactions of the child.

Only those children were considered chronically subefficient if at least two of these four factors had been present for at least three months. In this group are, therefore, not included children who suffer from what we call

fatiguability, which is a symptom of many organic diseases, such as heart disease, tuberculosis, or diseased tonsils. Nor do we have in mind acute fatigue which may be produced artificially by having a child do a definite and exhaustive amount of work; nor do we speak of that fatigue which follows in the trail of a contagious disease in children who go back to school before they have thoroughly recovered.

When we speak of chronic subefficiency we have in mind a condition which is psychic and physiologic, a condition in which the signs and symptoms may be predominantly psychological or emotional, or predominantly physical, but in which always more than one organ and more than one system is involved. It comes on slowly and is insidious. There are cases in which this condition may be congenital. I mean by that that some children whom we will call asthenic—meaning "without strength"—are born with an inferior make-up which predestines them to chronic subefficiency for the rest of their lives. That is the condition I have in mind when I speak of chronic subefficiency, or chronic fatigue.

The causes of chronic fatigue as I shall present them this afternoon are chiefly non-medical. I purposely avoid speaking of the medical side of fatigue, because it is not within the realm of parents and teachers, but rather within that of the medical profession. I am concerned this afternoon with the non-medical side of fatigue, which has to do with the social, economic, and emotional background of the child, which parents, teachers, and social workers can and should understand.

I might say in brief, that among the non-medical causes five are most important. This does not mean every

one of these five causes must obtain simultaneously. In fact, it is rare to find just one cause responsible for a child's chronic subefficiency. Usually, we have a combination of two or three or more. Chief among the causes ranks inadequate sleep, though it is not a cause per se, being usually the result of one or more of the other causes.

The second cause is inadequate diet, the third outside work for pay, the fourth excessive social activities, and the fifth inadequate conditions under which the child works in school. I mean by that improper lighting, improper ventilation, and all other factors which make up the hygiene of instruction. Those, I think, are the five most important causes. There are, of course, others, which time does not permit us to discuss.

If you know the causes, half of your problem is solved. If you do away with the causes, you will likely effect a cure. Moreover, you will prevent the occurrence of chronic fatigue. The treatment of fatigue, of course, must be left to the physician, but the prevention is within the scope of the parents and the teachers.

There is no measure in my mind that is more important for the prevention of fatigue than the establishment of an adequate health schedule. It is, of course, impossible to standardize health habits so that they might apply to all children. But I believe that a schedule which attempts to prescribe in definite doses sleep, food, physical and mental activity as well as the amount of play, will do a great deal toward the conservation of the health of our school children.

The schedule of rational habits of living, presented in this chart, has been constructed after a study of normal and fatigued children over periods varying from three

DAILY SCHEDULE OF RATIONAL HABITS FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN

Age in Years	Time of Rising	Breakfast Time	Time between Breakfast and School (Minutes)	Morning Session		Time between School and Luncheon (Minutes)	Luncheon Time	Time* between Luncheon and School (Minutes)	Afternoon Session		Supper Time	Free† Time in Minutes	Play‡ in Minutes	Miscellaneous§ Work Time		Bedtime¶	Hours of Sleep	Diet in Calories
				Begins at	Ends at				Begins at	Ends at				Physical	Mental			
6	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	11:30	30	12:00–12:30	45	1:15	3:00	6:00–6:30	180	180	0	0	6:30	12	1500–1600
7	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	11:30	30	12:00–12:30	45	1:15	3:00	6:00–6:30	180	180	0	0	6:30	12	1600–1700
8	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	11:45	30	12:00–12:30	30	1:15	3:15	6:00–6:30	195	195	0	0	7:00	11½	1700–1900
9	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	11:45	30	12:15–12:45	30	1:15	3:15	6:00–6:30	225	200	25	0	7:30	11	1900–2100
10	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	11:45	30	12:15–12:45	30	1:15	3:15	6:00–6:30	225	165	30	30	7:30	11	2100–2300
11	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	12:00	15	12:15–12:45	30	1:15	3:15	6:30–7:00	255	180	45	30	8:00	10½	2300–2500
12	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	12:00	15	12:15–12:45	30	1:15	3:15	6:30–7:00	285	180	60	45	8:30	10	2700–2900
13	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	12:00	15	12:15–12:45	30	1:15	3:15	6:30–7:00	300	180	60	60	9:00	9½	2900–3200
14	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	12:00	15	12:15–12:45	30	1:15	3:15	6:30–7:00	300	165	60	75	9:00	9½	3200–3400
15	7:00	7:45–8:05	40	8:45	12:00	15	12:15–12:45	30	1:15	3:15	6:30–7:00	300	165	60	75	9:00	9½	3300–3900

* 15–20 minutes of this time should be used as a rest period.

† By free time is meant the time between the end of the afternoon session and bedtime, the time spent at supper is not included.

‡ Part of the free time should be given to play, preferably out of doors.

§ Only a small proportion of their free time should be given to work requiring responsibility. Work is divided into physical and mental. No child under 9 years should be requested to do any mental or physical work out of school.

¶ 30 minutes are allowed between going to bed and falling asleep.

months to two years. It has been devised for children attending public school in Minneapolis. For use in other cities and, perhaps, more so in rural districts, slight variations may be necessary.

It is, of course, impossible to standardize every habit of all the school children, but a schedule of rational habits emphasizing specifically the more important points of personal hygiene may help to prevent fatigue in the majority of children. The chart is such an attempt. Most children in the first grade are between six and seven years of age, and the average age of the eighth-grade child is fourteen. Children who at fifteen years of age are still in public school must be grouped in the eighth grade. Seven o'clock has been decided upon for the time of rising. There is no need for any child to arise earlier, since no child should be allowed any physical or mental work before school. An adequate breakfast should be served with regularity from 7:45 to 8:05. Every child should remain at the table for twenty minutes. Too many children are allowed to go to school with empty stomachs, having drank but a cup of coffee and eaten but a slice of bread. Such children invariably show fatigue in the early hours of the forenoon.

With a rising time at 7:00 and school beginning at 8:45 there remain forty minutes before the morning session begins. It was with a purpose that we included this figure in our schedule. So many mothers are apt to say: "Why, there isn't any time in the morning. We have to rush our children to get to school on time." Would they actually figure out the time they would hardly hold that attitude. In the forty minutes between breakfast and school time there should be no need of rushing and no or-

ganized work or play should be assigned, so that the child shall be in a state of relaxation rather than of tension. School begins at 8:45 in all grades of the Minneapolis public schools and ends at 11:30 in the first grade, at 11:45 from the second to the fourth grade, and at 12:00 noon from the fifth grade up. Thirty minutes are allowed between the time school lets out and luncheon. A hot luncheon served at home or at school must be insisted upon. Cold sandwiches and coffee must be avoided. Every child should have fifteen minutes of complete rest between luncheon and the afternoon session. This rest will help to neutralize the morning's fatigue. School ends at 3:00 P.M. in the first grade and at 3:15 in the following grades. Supper should be served from 6:00 to 6:30 for children under ten years of age and from 6:30 to 7:00 for the older children.

Our social life is becoming more and more complex, our children are imitating the habits of their parents. Their daily activities have increased, the hours of sleep decreased. Our children must have more sleep if they are to be conserved. Twelve hours of sleep is the minimum need at six and seven years of age, eleven and a half hours at eight, eleven hours at nine and ten years, ten and a half hours at eleven, ten hours at twelve, and nine and a half at thirteen years and up. It is especially important to adhere to this minimum amount of nine and a half hours during puberty because of the special demands made on the organism by growth. The bedtime schedule is so arranged as to allow fifteen to thirty minutes for the child to fall asleep. I have computed the free time that the children have at their disposal after school until bedtime, and have devised a schedule, by which this free time is divided

into time for play and time for work, mental as well as physical. Children six and seven years old have one hundred and eighty minutes of free time. This time should be entirely spent in free and unrestricted play and games, since the sudden precipitation into a sedentary and mental life makes them especially susceptible to fatigue.

It is not only unnecessary but it is dangerous for a child of this age to study music and do home work. Principals, school teachers, and musicians, who are genuinely interested in the welfare of the child, believe that home study and music lessons should be delayed until the age of ten years. At the age of nine, when the great increase of growth is on the decline, especially that of the brain, the children may begin to have some responsible work, preferably physical. Twenty-five minutes of chores for either boy or girl is sufficient. Two hundred minutes or 80 per cent of the total free time should be devoted to play. At the age of ten, 18 per cent of the free time or forty minutes daily is devoted to work, and 82 per cent for play. Of the forty minutes, twenty-five is given for physical duty and fifteen minutes to mental work. This fifteen minutes can be used for music or home studies if necessary. At eleven years, 72 per cent of the free time or one hundred eighty-five minutes is allotted for play and 28 per cent or seventy minutes for work. Of the seventy minutes, forty-five minutes should be reserved for physical and twenty-five minutes for mental work. At and after twelve years, there is a steady increase of mental and physical work. Of the two hundred eighty-five minutes of free time, 66 per cent or one hundred eighty minutes are for play and 34 per cent for work. At this age, one hundred five minutes are allowed for work, sixty minutes for physical and

forty-five minutes for mental. At thirteen years, 60 per cent of the time is for play and 40 per cent for work. This allows one hour for physical and one hour for mental work and the remaining three hours for miscellaneous activities. At fourteen and fifteen years, the work time is increased 9 per cent, giving one hundred sixty-five minutes or 57 per cent for play and 43 per cent for work, fifteen minutes more for mental work than for physical.

Now may I again repeat some of the fundamental points that I think of practical interest to our parents, to every teacher, every social worker, and possibly also physicians. First of all, chronic fatigue or chronic subefficiency is not a symptom, it is a disorder. It is recognized in four ways: first, by the complaints of the child, the so-called feelings of fatigue; second, by the decrease in the individual's average capacity for work in school; third, by a decrease in the physical strength and endurance of the child; and fourth, by signs of emotional unbalance.

Then the second important point to remember is the non-medical causes: inadequate sleep, inadequate diet, homework for pay, excessive social activities, and physical factors which interfere with adequate hygiene of instruction; and, finally, the most important thing in my mind in the prevention of fatigue is the understanding and establishment of an adequate schedule of health habits.

We do not pay enough attention to health habits, because it is so simple to understand, and because it is taken for granted. If these health habits were expensive to apply, if they were labeled with a Latin formula, if they were rather difficult to understand, we might be more apt to pay attention to them, but it is because they are so simple that we neglect them.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EARLY YEARS

INTRODUCTION

Edna N. White, Director, Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Michigan

The outstanding importance of the preschool years in the life of the child would seem to be no longer questioned —it might almost claim to be the fad of the hour.

From the physical standpoint, the handicaps presented by the children who are entering school certainly offer convincing evidence of the necessity of supervision and attention to health during the preschool period. On the mental side a well-known psychologist has said "that in one sense the amount of mental growth which takes place in the first sexennium of life far exceeds anything which the child achieves in any subsequent period." This is the period where the child's subsequent attitudes toward authority, affection, and reality are determined.

Probably the importance of the development of social attitudes even exceeds those of the physical and mental. It has been assumed that little children are individualistic and not responsive to social contacts. Experience with groups of preschool children does not confirm this theory; on the contrary, they seem both to enjoy and profit by association with each other fully as much as older children.

The educational problems of these years are varied: the development of vocabulary; motor controls; appreciations of color, rhythm, tone, habit formation and attitudes toward life and its problems belong to these early years. Understanding of abilities and methods of training are

yet to be formulated for teachers and parents who are interested in the all-round development of the child. Before this can be done specialists in the various fields must study preschool children individually and in groups and interpret their needs in terms of modern science.

One of the new agencies developed for this purpose is the nursery school as it has been organized in a few centers in America. These centers co-operate with the parents in determining and interpreting the needs of the children they enrol, and serve as laboratories for parental education. The information gathered by these groups should form the basis for a real understanding of the problems of preschool education. In this purpose they differ entirely from the nursery schools of English type which were organized to meet a social need.

THE NURSERY SCHOOL AND THE PRESENT SOCIAL ORDER

Patty Smith Hill, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

Education moves from above downward. Hitherto the youngest members of society, the weakest and most helpless have been ignored until the needs of the colleges, the high schools, and the elementary schools were well established. Today mothers are asking that their young children's rights to a just proportion of the school tax be recognized, as their older children's have for centuries. Kindergartens, Montessori Houses of Childhood, and nursery schools have been organized as a response to these demands.

What are the influences which have worked together to bring about the beginnings of preschool education? Among the most important have been war and industry, with their disintegrating effect upon the home. The crowding of families into tenements and slums, the going out of the mother into industry, the bringing of work into the home where the children too were pressed into service —all these changes have played their part in the development of nurseries and nursery schools.

Furthermore, psychoanalysis, leading later on to mental and social hygiene and psychiatry, has called attention to the importance of conditions surrounding the child before the sixth year because of their influence upon his later life. The health movement, too, which was started during the war and brought about the introduction

of medical inspection into the schools, traced the causes of physical troubles back to an earlier and earlier age until they were found to have developed a good start before the child entered school. These discoveries have led naturally to new attention to the training of the young child at the preschool age.

In the important years before formal school work begins, we who have been closely associated with the nursery-school movement believe that it offers certain definite advantages over the average home. To begin with, it is an institution planned specifically for the child and his demands at this period. In the home the rights of all the other members of the family rightly must be considered. The nursery school has to meet only the needs of the young child. Moreover, what family can have its baby inspected daily to keep it well instead of curing it after it is ill? The nursery school offers, as no home, even the home of wealth, is likely to offer, the daily care of doctors, nurses, psychologists, psychiatrists, and nutrition specialists.

The mother has to be trained to meet the needs of children of all ages. The nursery school, on the other hand, can have a teacher trained especially for the care of the preschool child—a specialist in the education of the two-, three-, and four-year-old.

Equipment is another advantage that the nursery school has over the home. Because the homes of the well-to-do have mahogany tables, lovely china, and fine rugs, the period of two to four, before the mother knows it, becomes a "No, no" period. The nursery school plans equipment that says to a child "Yes, yes." It provides sur-

roundings which cannot harm the child and which the child, in turn, cannot injure.

Many of us who have been associated with the nursery-school movement for years are convinced that to be continually in the presence of anyone under any conditions twenty-four hours in the day, week in and week out, month in and month out, year in and year out, is rather trying. It sets the family pattern too exclusively. Either friction occurs when people are together too much, or the relationship between the mother and the child, and the family and the child, may become intensified and the child and the mother grow too dependent upon each other. When this happens I do not know whom to feel sorrier for, the mother or the child. The nursery school gives them both a rest from each other's companionship for a few hours in the day.

Again, few homes can hope to offer little children the regularity which is easily attained in the nursery school. With the very best intentions in the world there are in the home continual interruptions in the schedule of food, sleep, open air, play, and the other elements in the life of the young child. Anyone who has had the care of young children knows that regularity at this period means both morality and health. You have a very well-behaved baby as long as things are regular, and you have a very disturbed and difficult problem in behavior when this regularity is altered.

I am convinced of the fact that what we call personality is due largely to having many varieties of natural modes of expression in early life. Some of us grow up inarticulate because the opportunities for expression in childhood were headed off. The nursery school provides

normal channels of expression for the baby. He learns to "say it with" words, with gestures, with investigation, with dramatization, with art, with rhythm. He learns to express himself to his playmates. In the nursery school questions on sex matters are met squarely, and the child is so prepared that many of the problems of adolescence will take care of themselves. No element is more important to the child's mental health than this frank facing of sex questions.

Finally, the baby at two years gets an examination in nursery school which is usually denied to children until they get into the criminal courts. One Juvenile Court worker who was on our program when we first attempted to organize the nursery schools in New York last June said that this was the first form of education he had ever come in contact with which he felt was actually "on time!" I see no reason in the world why we should give our children no thorough examination as to character, personality, and social background until we find them in our criminal courts. The nursery school moves that examination up to the second year so that it will be not only on time but ahead of time.

Yet, important as are the benefits of the nursery school for the child, it does not exist for the child alone. It has grown up in a changing world that needed a new, flexible institution to help solve the family problem, to help meet the needs of the mother, the father, and the older children as well as the baby. A great change is taking place in the home, and there is widespread alarm, some of it justified, I believe, and some of it unnecessary. Why, if every other institution is changing, must we attempt to keep the home exactly as it was in our grand-

mother's day? We cannot do it if we would! We might as well face that fact. Nevertheless, I believe there is more resistance to change in the home than in any other institution, including the church, with its conflict between fundamentalism and modernism.

The father who prides himself on improvements in finance and industry and transportation is overwhelmed when he sees the kitchenette taking the place of the kitchen, when he sees the wife no longer lending her powers to the production of those ideal pies that mother used to make, even though he may get just as good, and better in Mary Elizabeth's tearoom, just around the corner. We must give him credit, however, for the fact that all his alarm is not over the pies; what he is greatly worried about is the change from his mother's type. It cannot be denied that the status of the woman, the wife, the mother, the homemaker is changed, and neither the home nor society is so organized that it can at present adjust itself to this change. Society has adapted itself to the right of the father to go on with his profession, but when the mother goes out, the young generation stands in danger of being neglected.

We cannot turn the wheels back, so we must face the change in the home with courage. We must see to it that we build a family life that will survive any outward changes in its setting, a family life that will endure even though the altar of the home may have to be set up in a two-room apartment with a kitchenette or in the much despised hotel with opportunities for service of meals. Whatever happens, it requires genius and a new consecration to the determination that home and family life on a higher order must be preserved and evolve.

There is no unit in social life that can compete with the home, I believe, in the control of human destiny. This is most of all possible in early childhood. The home should be the peaceful haven to which all the members of the family return. It is pre-eminently the shelter offered by society to tender, growing personalities, not yet strong enough to stand the hardships and the buffeting of the wide, wide world. But unless all the personalities in the home have an equal chance for development and service inside the home as well as out, I do not see how we can hope that mental, moral, and physical health will be the outgrowth of the home of the future.

In order to have an ideal family life, I do not believe that certain members of the family have to sacrifice their rights to growth, to development, and to service outside. This fall we made case studies of families where one member was left behind, was sacrificed for the good of the whole, and it made very interesting reading matter. I firmly believe not only that the one who is left behind does not grow, but that those who go forward do not grow as they should if they leave behind any member of the family. Most of the tragedies that take place in family life are due to the fact that the older generation, especially the mother, is often left behind with her standards and her ideals while the younger generation goes forward with new standards and new ideals. That means that they cannot come together. The gap in the family! Those who go forward are sacrificed as well as the one who is left behind.

Many good managers of home and family life are finding, after their children reach the school age, a way for social service outside the home, and even for some

economic independence. There begins to be alarm when you talk about outside interests and economic independence for mothers. I do not see why, if society were organized differently, there should not be an arrangement whereby, when children are old enough to go to school—even a nursery school—certain hours of the day should not belong to the mother of the family for recreation, development, study, growth, for social and civic service, and, if need be, for some economic independence. I have had to learn that by hard knocks. I didn't believe it for years, but now I have come to think that the people who have been urging this adjustment have something valuable to contribute to us.

Let us consider, then, what types of mothers need the help of the nursery school. Unquestionably, the mother who goes out of the home to work needs help in caring for her children. The difficulty here is that she needs it from seven in the morning until seven at night, which is a longer period than the nursery school can maintain a high educational level without great expense. No nursery-school teacher can possibly keep her health and strength and a high level of teaching and care of children who tries to spread her energy over that number of hours. We have tried it; we have co-operated with several day nurseries in New York City and we reached the point where we had to insist upon our nursery-school teachers being weighed every week just as we had the children weighed, to be sure we were not robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The mother who stays at home and brings in work and the mother who goes out for part-day service also needs help. A number of years ago when I was first inter-

ested in the opening of our nursery schools, I looked into the proportion of women of the laboring class who were out of the home for two, three, and four hours a day. I was quite surprised to see how industry was adapting itself to this part-time work. Frequently on Broadway near where I live a sign would be hanging out which read like this "Wanted, a clerk for two hours." In one of our very large restaurants I found that many of the waitresses were mothers, serving for two or three hours, getting economic independence. If I had the time I would like to tell you how a little, ignorant Irish woman opened my eyes to what this economic independence means in some families. She told me of the difference in her home life—in the attitude of her husband toward her, in her own feeling of independence, and what she had to offer to her children—when she didn't have to beg for her streetcar fare from her husband.

On the other hand, the mother who stays at home all day needs and needs badly the kind of help that the nursery school can offer her. If we only knew something about the problem of the woman who is on the job twenty-four hours out of the twenty-four, I think we would have more sympathy with her. Again and again this tragedy happens in New York: a young mother who has not yet had youth killed in her wants to get away for a little while. She locks the door of the apartment, leaves her children there, and goes to the movies. There is a tenement fire and the next morning our newspapers have a great deal to say about the selfishness of the mother. I think she needs sympathy as well as condemnation.

In one city we found large numbers of mothers living within four blocks of the river who had never seen it!

One of the things we did was to get the street-car companies of that city to give us checks, two for five cents instead of five cents each, to get these mothers to go with their families to the parks. Women like these are tied in because they think they cannot get out. They belong to an organization which has been described thus: "This organization has no association, affiliation or connection in any way, shape, form or manner with any political league of voters; membership more than 4,205,000; a branch in every state; a chapter in every congressional district; it is called the association of overworked and underpaid dishwashing housewives; headquarters by the cook stove, with the cradle near at hand and the washtub not far off." That type of mother, I think, needs a great deal of help.

Then, too, there is a large number of highly intelligent women, many of whom have had a college education, whose husband's salaries do not justify a nurse, or in some instances even a cook. These mothers of the professional class, which is notably underpaid, have great need of part-day care for their children. For these reasons it seems to me that the nursery school must be a very flexible institution, adapting itself to the type of mother it serves. Here it might be possible to get a group of highly intelligent mothers to carry out an afternoon program such as we would give the children, had we the whole-day care of them, and thus this type of woman could get the service she needs.

Then there is the woman who is very able, efficient, and capable, and who is either unwilling to marry or if married is unwilling to have children because she cannot see her way clear, unless she gives up her professional career, to provide for those children what she had when

she was growing up. Yet this is the very woman from whom we should expect the best in the way of stock for the next generation. We are hard on her and I used to be, but I am not now. I believe that if society would manage some way to provide for this high-grade woman part-day care for her child, more of her type would marry and bring children into the world. The world needs her children badly and I see no better way to provide for the future than to give her through the nursery school the service she needs.

The last mother I have reference to is the one whom I personally am most likely to be hard upon. This is the one who stays at home, lives in luxury, and has all the maids she wants. In the old days her children were cared for by the unemployed women who hung around every household. Do you realize that a generation ago a married sister had at least one spinster sister who held herself in readiness to live for the sister's family? Or else there was a grandmother who could take the child for a little while. We often wonder what has become of the grandmothers today. All of us in my generation can look back to mothers and grandmothers who at forty put on the little bonnet and tied the little bow very tightly and primly under their chins and were supposed to take their place by the chimney side. But now that the grandmothers and maiden aunts are disappearing, the mother of this type farms out her babies to nurses who have had no training whatever, nurses who have in many instances uniforms that look very much better on the outside than the type of mind they dress. This mother is perfectly satisfied to be economically a consumer and not a producer. If she produces children she turns them over to others and asks few ques-

tions. Has she talents? I sometimes wonder. If she has, she shows no evidence of wanting them trained.

I wish we would turn on this latter type of mother the contempt that we tend to turn upon the woman who longs to have her abilities trained and used outside as well as inside of the home. To her I would be glad to say, "If you will develop your talent for your family and yourself I will be one of those to open an institution and take care of your baby for a few hours a day in order to let you go out into the world and play your part."

The nursery school, then, has come into being because of a changing society. Shortage in houses, limited space, people crowding into smaller and smaller apartments, our inability to secure domestic help, the lack of maiden sisters, aunts, and other unemployed female relatives to help us are all factors in this change. The nursery school is a flexible institution planned to meet the need of the new home and family life, which must be organized on the highest level that it has ever reached in our history.

THE MOTIVATION OF THE YOUNG CHILD

John E. Anderson, Director, Institute of Child Welfare, University of Minnesota

The problem of the motivation of the young child is the problem of the origin of the energy of the young child, and the effective direction of that energy. When we consider the source of children's energy, we see at once that the child is active because he is a living being and that activity is in a sense synonymous with life. The display of energy is an indication of living. Many parents do not realize this fact and expect the preschool child to be a piece of furniture, looking upon an inactive, "goody-goody" type of child as the normal, healthy child. The active and energetic child is much nearer being the normal, healthy child than is the quiet, placid, and good child who is so much easier to control.

The second point that we note in connection with the activity of the child is that it is not simply the result of unconfined energy, but that it is energy which is manifested in certain ways. We have been told many times that the parent or teacher is in the position of a sculptor molding a sort of plastic medium. But this is not the case. The child is not plastic, is not a medium which is to be molded this way or that completely at the will of the individual who is controlling the child. A better simile is made when we compare the child with a complicated and involved piece of machinery, by all odds much more complicated and involved than any piece of machinery that we know, and when we compare the parent and teacher

with an engineer guiding a machine which by virtue of its own structure has certain definite limitations.

With this in mind, we see at once that the energy which lies back of the activity of the child is expended in accordance with its organization, that is, the manner in which the child is constructed. In other words, the child, like a bit of machinery, operates in certain ways rather than in an utterly hit-or-miss fashion. At the moment organization begins, the possibilities of the expenditure of energy are limited by that very organization. The limitations imposed by the very nature of the child arise partly out of its anatomical structure, and partly out of its nervous system—that complex conduction device which connects receiving organ with muscle and gland. To use several crude but striking instances, we may point out the fact that neither the child nor the adult can scratch the middle of his back as readily as he can scratch his chest, because anatomically, he is not built that way. Neither can the adult nor the child react to X-rays as he can to light rays within the spectrum, because his nervous mechanism is not built that way. When the mouth region of the infant is stimulated by a nipple, the lips of the infant close about the nipple and suckling starts. Under this stimulation, the infant does not run, or stand on its head, but goes through a very definite and specific response, because it is built in that way—all because of limitations laid down in its very nature on the expenditure of energy.

We speak of these limitations on the expenditure of energy as inherited, and cover by that term a whole host of devices both structural and functional which lay out the limits within which the organism must function. If we are considering the behavior of the individual, we

speak of reflexes, instincts, and emotions, or in more modern terms of inherited pattern reactions, referring by this term to the fact that the energy of the child must, by its very nature, be expended in certain definite patterns. While it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss such reactions in detail, I wish to make it very clear that the parent undertaking the training of a child does not start with a plastic substance that can be molded this way or that way in accordance with the wishes and desires of the parent but rather with a very complex and involved organization that functions in certain ways and which has both limitations and potentialities. The parent or teacher is rather in the position of an engineer whose engine properly guided and controlled can expend its energy effectively; or improperly and poorly guided and controlled, may do incalculable harm, tear itself to pieces and wreck and destroy much that is about, possibly the engineer himself. No one undertakes, save at very great risk, to operate an engine without some preliminary study of its possibilities and its limitations. Effective guidance and direction does not come full-fledged into being, but rather springs from that careful and thorough study for which the groups arranging this conference stand.

Carrying our simile still farther, we come clearly to see that the child is a self-propelling type of machine, the energy and activity of which originate in its internal structure. Literally then, whatever we may do to the child, we do not put into the child force, energy, nor activity, that is, we do not impell it, but rather bring out from it that which is already in it by virtue of its very nature. Our relation to the child is in no sense that of the sculptor to his clay, nor that of an owner to his personal prop-

erty, but rather that of an engineer handling a strong yet delicate engine, or that of a trustee handling a property for its own best development. We are engineers rather than sculptors, trustees rather than owners.

The problem of the motivation of the young child is hence inextricably bound up with the guidance and direction of the child's activities rather than with doing as we will with a completely receptive and plastic medium. The very title of this paper conveys a wrong impression in so far as it suggests that we motivate the child—the child, in truth, furnishes his own motivation. We take advantage of the potentiality within him and either guide and direct him into successful and useful activity, or divert and prostitute that which is within him.

Further, as we consider this problem of motivating the child, we see that the child with its already built-up organization is put in contact with an exceedingly complicated and involved environment, that we are taking an organism which has been evolved through some hundreds of thousands of years and fitting it to a social structure which at best is a few thousand years old, and so far as many of its details are concerned is less than one hundred years old.

What is the nature of this thing we call environment? What does it do to this complex and involved bundle of possibilities? We know that the behavior of the child is an expression of the relationship between its innate constitution and the environment with which it is surrounded. This environment consists of our language, our physical possessions, our appliances, our homes, our customs, our traditions, our institutions. Everything with which the child is surrounded from birth to maturity is affected or

modified in some way by that which we call our social heritage, many elements of which are artifacts and run counter to the innate organization of the human.

From this platform, you have already had considerable emphasis placed upon the social environment of the child. In order to bring out clearly the complexity of the adjustment we expect even our preschool children to make, I suggest that you would find it a very interesting and informative procedure sometime to sit down in your home and write down a list of all objects and devices in your immediate environment from which you ask reactions on the part of the young child, comparing those physical objects with the similar environment of twenty-five or fifty years ago. You will be astounded at the specific bits of apparatus, of furniture, of devices of one sort and another to which the young child must be brought to react. If you wish to go further and describe the persons and social situations to which you also expect reactions, your list will be long and involved indeed.

Consider also for a moment an important shift in the environment of the young child that has taken place within recent years. It is not so long ago that the great majority of young children passed through the preschool period on farms or in small urban communities with plenty of things about the home—tools, boards, pieces of metal, bowlders, animals, etc., to which there was easy access—whereas now the majority of our preschool children grow up in tenements, duplexes, or apartments with relatively small area, few objects easy of access, and restrictions galore.

From whichever point of view we approach it, we see how involved is the problem of motivation. It becomes

more involved when we realize that whatever the environment, the child will make some sort of adjustment. Our problem of motivating the child then goes back to a somewhat deeper problem as we seek an answer to the question whither, i.e., for what type of life, we are motivating the child.

We must, as parents, decide to some extent what kind of a child we want by deciding what kind of an adult we want. We must, if we are to surround our youngsters with the best possible situations, consider very carefully and definitely the relationship between childish situations and adult reactions. We must, somehow or other, get away from the idea of handling the child in its early period for our own convenience or in the easiest possible way, or with a minimum of trouble or with a minimum of disturbance to the household; and consider the relationship of the young child to the man or to the woman. It may very well be that a certain amount of rigorous treatment in the early period of a child's life may mean a well-adjusted adult. It may well be that too great laxity in the handling of the very small child may bring with it serious difficulty in adult life. It may well be that the thing which is the easiest and most convenient for us, as parents, to do is from the standpoint of the whole life of the individual quite the worst thing that might have been done. Our problem is to consider not so much the isolated bits of behavior we see from day to day as to consider the whole course of the child's life; and to as great a degree as possible orient and organize the child's situation about that life course. What kind of an adult do you want? Do you wish an adult who is frank and straightforward? Do you wish an adult who speaks excellent English? Do you wish

an adult who is calm, poised, and emotionally well balanced? Do you wish an adult who is versatile and can meet a variety of situations? Do you want an adult who can go through life with never-failing courage and faith?

Note that in the preceding discussion I am not seeking an imposition of adult ideals or modes of behavior upon the child but rather trying to emphasize that effective motivation in childhood, including the period of very young childhood, involves not only a careful study of the child as he is, but also careful and thoughtful consideration of the child in the whole process of becoming an adult. The child coming in contact with an environment will make many responses, some of which must be selected, others which must be eliminated. Successful adjustment at the adult level is not so much a matter of the responses which first appear, as it is a matter of the selection from among responses first appearing. Character, sanity, personality are not accidents but are achievements attained through a struggle between conflicting modes of response which begin at the cradle.

Can we formulate any general principles with reference to the training of the young child which can be interpreted in the light of the preceding discussion of motivation; in other words, can we discuss the kind of environment with which the child should be surrounded? I have attempted to state a few such principles which seem to me important in setting up the proper motivation in the young child, looking toward a surrounding of the child with specific situations which may be effective in providing desirable adult types of reaction.

One of the very first principles is that in the young child's life, we must provide a certain amount of regu-

larity and constancy in the environment. If the environment of the child is too shifting, is continuously changing, is either physically, intellectually, or emotionally too varied, there is no opportunity for him to build up consistent reactions to his environment. This principle of regularity and constancy of environment applies almost as soon as the child is born. Regular habits of eating and of sleeping in the infant and the young child constitute a frame work about which other desirable habits can be erected. We sometimes look upon regular habits of eating and of sleeping as purely health matters which extend only to the physical level, but they are far more than health matters in a narrow sense. Many of the most difficult problem children that you find in the preschool period are children who in infancy have not been held to an exact eating or sleeping schedule.

What does the building up of the fairly constant external situation do with reference to the individual? It enables the individual to build a reaction to a specific situation and thus to be free for meeting other situations in the environment. If his sleeping periods are irregular, the eating is irregular, he is definitely handicapped. If the mother is angry at the child at one moment, and an instant later grasps the child to her bosom and cuddles it up, you have a shifting emotional reaction to which the child finds it very difficult to adjust. If you tell the child today that he must be a good boy and go to sleep, and tomorrow you tell the child that he must be a good boy and stay awake, you need not wonder that the child has difficulty in building up a correct reaction to the types of instruction you are giving.

Emotional stability on the part of the parent, con-

sistency of reaction with reference to many of the situations with which the child is surrounded, are much more important principles of training than is the severity or laxness of the discipline. I am sure that you will find cases where individuals outwardly are apparently very lax in handling their children, in which you will find running through the laxness a consistency of handling certain situations which enables the child to build fundamental habits and which gives him in the ever changing situations with which he is surrounded the possibility of forming proper habits of adjustment.

The second general principle of considerable importance is that the child should be given considerable freedom within limits. Too regular and too constant an environment is quite as bad as is too shifting and inconstant an environment. We do not wish the child so far as his behavior is concerned to be unalterably tied to a fixed schedule. The opportunity for giving the child freedom in considerable amount arises particularly in connection with his play activity. One of the things which the world values most highly is spontaneity, initiative, and zest in life, and one of the problems that we as adults face in handling our children is to take the interest, initiative, and zest of the young child and carry it over to reactions on an adult level. That cannot be done if we surround the child from its earliest period with too constrained and too rigorous and too continuously dampening an environment.

In this connection, I should like to bring out a point with reference to the learning process itself. A knowledge of the manner in which human beings learn when confronted with a new situation or a new problem is exceedingly helpful in producing a sympathetic understanding

of the process through which the child is going. Although we do a great deal of lip service to trial-and-error behavior, we are too apt in our training to think of the final habit with its smooth-running, well-organized semi-automatic process without realizing that it has come out of random behavior with its many superfluous and unnecessary movements.

I have a feeling that, if in the early part of learning a child is surrounded by too many prohibitions and inhibitions, the effect of the prohibitions and inhibitions is not to eliminate the undesirable features of the response, but to kill the motivation of the child for the whole series of responses which he is trying to undertake so that later on, after the individual has moved through this early period of adjustment, what we sometimes call negative instruction can be given, because now the motivation of the individual with respect to the particular habit is well established and the negative instruction tends to eliminate undesirable features of the response.

If, on setting out to learn to play golf, you were from the first too continuously reminded by your teacher or companion of your inefficiency, your bad shots, your poor performance, within a very short time, you would throw away your clubs and go home. If, instead, you were rewarded by favorable comments on your good shots with ignoring of your poor attempts, your motivation for the game would continue. Sometime later, after your interest was well developed, the negative instruction would come in quite naturally as a device for eliminating undesirable elements of your reaction. The relationship between negative instruction and the stage of learning is well worth investigation.

A third and very important principle contemplates the provision in the environment of the young child of a complex and varied educative equipment. Here is an individual, interested and active, with many possibilities. If the environment is too simple, either because of limited equipment or because of too great readiness on the part of those with the child to do things for him, he is robbed of the opportunity of developing fundamental manipulative and intellectual skills. A child learns to lace shoes, not from shoes locked in a closet nor from shoes laced by his mother, but from actually attempting many times to lace shoes himself.

An interesting case comes to my mind. This boy constituted a serious problem in that he was continuously running out in the road getting in the way of automobiles. His parents had spanked him, they cajoled him, they had begged him, they tried every possible device they could to meet the situation. On visiting the house, you saw a typical, modern suburban home, with a beautiful little house set out on a perfectly smooth lawn, with nice hedges, and everything in apple-pie order. The child was turned out in the yard to grow up, without a single item of equipment, not a single device anywhere around which had any interest whatever. The only object in his environment which possessed any educative value or had any attraction was the road, and his response to the road was a perfectly natural and obvious reaction to the situation.

A few boards, blocks, old bits of metal, some sand, some old cooking utensils, and much less of the housekeeper attitude about the place would have provided that small child with the opportunities for education demanded by the stage of his development and would have met the

problem. Together with the restriction of play space to which the modern child is subjected, we have also tended to eliminate from his immediate environment many objects and play opportunities which facilitate the development of motor and intellectual skills.

An investigation now being made on the effect of our nursery school on the behavior of the child on Saturday and Sunday when not in school is of some significance. We thought that parents might find their children harder to control and more dissatisfied on Saturday and Sunday than was the case previous to the nursery school régime. Over and over again, the parents told us that the children were easier to control on Saturday and Sunday than formerly, and that the child was happy and contented at being alone. More detailed inquiry revealed the fact that the children knew better how to play and how to utilize their playthings and objects about the house. In other words, the nursery school had provided a play content which we as parents are apt not to give the child.

Here, too, I would stress a point which may not have occurred to you, the opportunity afforded by conversation and discussion with the young child. Linguistic play is quite as important an educational agent as play in the ordinary sense. The presence of individuals who are willing to talk with the child furnishes one of the greatest educational opportunities. The theory that the child is to be parked during the preschool period and left just to grow is unsound, because such a procedure constitutes a mental starvation in a very real sense.

The fourth principle, which is closely related to the preceding, concerns the desirability of providing social contacts for the young child, not only with adults, but

with children of his own age. We have been amazed at the early age at which many of the attitudes which we ordinarily look upon as characteristic of the older child and adult develop. Three- and four-year-olds, in groups, show sharply defined and distinct social attitudes. The setting-up of desirable attitudes before undesirable ones have become too strongly fixed is essential. In an atmosphere where give and take is a matter of course, where each individual must co-operate with other individuals, fundamental habits of meeting situations which may persist throughout the whole lifetime of the individual may be developed. Too often, undesirable and unsocial types of behavior are motivated in the only child—one can hardly be an only child all his life.

As a fifth and final principle, I would emphasize the provision, in the environment of the child, of positive opportunities for the development of character and moral qualities. Here we come to a problem in motivation on which we have astonishingly little information in the literature. We have much about behavior problems; we ask ourselves many times what to do when this response goes wrong, what to do when the child does not eat spinach, what to do when the child sucks his thumb. We collect many case histories and make studies of problem children. Why should we not quite as assiduously collect cases and make studies of children with desirable behavior traits, using the clinical method. Instead of asking what is wrong, let us sometimes ask what is right. It is barely possible that we are becoming so problem-conscious that we are losing sight of the aim of child-training. I appeal to you as parents and as students of child behavior to seek out and study specific instances which show the effect

of the introduction of positive rather than negative techniques, which show what to do quite as much as what not to do.

I think here particularly of an incident which occurred the other day in a family with which I am familiar. The parents of the four small children quite early decided that they would bring up the children in an attitude in which bumps and pain were taken largely as a matter of course, and, whenever the children fell or bumped into things, passed off the bump as an incident rather than actually sympathizing with the children. It became quite a game in that household. These children, the other day, were to be inoculated with a preventive serum. They went into the waiting-room, did an "eeny meeny miny mo" to see which one should go in first, with the result that the four-year-old child went in first.

As he was being inoculated, the needle happened to break off in his arm, making it necessary to remove it, a somewhat painful process. He stood there with his teeth clenched, his fists tight, tears almost bursting out of his eyes, without uttering a sound. When he returned to the waiting-room, his older sister said, "Did it hurt?" The boy said, "Naw." This was a four-year-old child. I have a feeling that through the atmosphere in which he has been brought up he has developed a positive series of reactions to pain-and-bump situations, which are the forerunners of those things which we call courage and faith and strength in the adult and which enable an individual to carry through in this thing that we call life.

DETERMINISMS IN CHILDHOOD

Dr. Ira S. Wile, Associate in Pediatrics, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York City

I view man partially as an isolated animal, and partially as the result of his environment; not merely as a being that is physical in his relationships, but as one also spiritual in his relationships. Like other animals he has undergone many metamorphoses. Particularly does he change, I like to think, as the insects do, because they number among them the most social of the animals, such as the ants and the bees. By analogy at least, he may be regarded as undergoing transformations similar to those of some insects, as for example, butterflies and moths. This metamorphosis involves a change from the egg to that crawly thing that some people call a caterpillar, and others technically term a larva; then after shedding various skins in order to promote growth, and after going through sundry changes in development, the larva locks itself up for a period of time in a cocoon, and there becomes transformed into a creature which is like neither the larva that went into it, nor the mature animal that emerges from it. The transitional stage is known as a pupa, out of which and within which is to develop the mature insect—the *imago*.

One cannot predict all the characteristics or qualities of the pupa by studying the isolated larva; nor can we be certain of the changes that we undergo as we develop through the caterpillar stage of existence, which is early childhood, molting from infancy into early childhood, and

into pre-adolescence, and then entering a sort of cocoon during adolescence to facilitate alterations of profound importance physically, mentally, and morally, prior to emerging as still developing adults.

Evolution offers the idea that the individual and the race are the resultant product of a reaction between an organism and its physical environment.

The strict hereditarian, with a most compulsive biologic thought even in the realm of psychology, probably would agree with Professor Woodworth in his statement concerning the fertilized ovum: "This microscopic, featureless creature is already a human individual, with certain of its feature traits—those that we call native—already settled. It is a human being as distinguished from any other species, it is a white or colored individual, male or female, blonde or brunette, tall or short, stocky or slender, mentally gifted or deficient, perhaps a born musician, or adventurer, or leader of men." The egg has considerable responsibility.

All eggs do not hatch as expected. Childhood may realize the potentialities of the egg, and it may not. Maturity may reflect the promise of the egg; on the other hand, the egg may turn out to be a spot, or even a rot.

But childhood is a selected period of life, a period of growth and development that virtually has no beginning and has no well-defined end. Life is a continuity from conception through birth to death and from death to rebirth. Whether we start to study the preschool age, or whether we inquire into conditions at the time of birth, or whether we investigate early or late adolescence, we face the fact of a continuous development. As students we set up artificial points in time and in space from which

we take surveys of life-situations, but childhood and adolescence are merely phases of a continuity of living. We note an age as beginning at adolescence because certain glands function somewhat more actively then than earlier in life, although probably no part of the body is wholly free from functioning at any time of its existence.

Man is not perfect; he is not perfect as an animal, nor as a gregarious social being. Biology does not account for all of his imperfections. Few things in life are wholly biological; even the death-rate is not wholly biological. Rickets is not solely a problem of biology, it is also a question of sociology. Mental deficiency itself is a relative term. Binet was the first to recognize this fact when he remarked that a person might be normal in rural France and feeble-minded in Paris. So we have come to make various distinctions between a physical handicap and a social handicap.

A person may be socially handicapped and evidence no physical handicap at all, and vice versa. Many phases of man's personality and nature are due to causes that thus far are undiscoverable by our present methods of refined analysis, examination, and diagnosis. Hence, I am a little disturbed at times when I find that physical perfection is being stressed to so great an extent, and that often there is inadequate attention given to the necessity for preparation for social living and to the social guidance that may be of greater service to the individual and to the group, of which he is a unit.

Now my theme is determinisms. It sounds like a highly technical term. What are the things that determine the nature of childhood, its needs, and its personality?

Determinism is a philosophical concept, indicating

that all the events in the physical world fall into the principle of causation and effect. Life consists of absolutely dependent factors functioning in the relation of cause and effect. If this single cause is applied, this effect must necessarily follow. The cause being given, the event of necessity follows. Such constitutes a straight, rigid determinism. As a matter of fact, determinism is generally accepted for a great many things in life, with the exception of the field of ethics and behavior which has a larger unpredictable element in it.

Determinism is very simple when a unit stimulus is applied to a unit body and there results a unit response. That is a perfectly understandable example of cause and effect, but one is dealing with a single cause and a single effect. Rickets, however, is not the effect of one cause; it has many causes. To eliminate or cure all rickets some would say just have more and brighter sunshine, or keep the child in the fresh air, or give every child cod-liver oil, or increase home education in dietetics so that every infant will get the requisite amount of vitamins *a, b, c.* The application of one of these four principles would not eradicate rickets because no one of them involves its sole determiner. Although there is no proved single causal factor in rickets one finds protagonists taking now this angle, now that, now another one, so that one can find ample testimony to the effect that this, that, or the other is the determining factor.

If one attempts to explain why children are slow in walking or are delayed in speech, or why they run away from home, play truant, steal, or lie, one immediately enters a still more difficult field where causations are multiple and where single determinisms are not as natural nor

as truly existent as one would believe from the claims of various persons propounding and defending certain deterministic theories.

Fortunately special investigations have occupied the thought of particular groups—but their conclusions need not be regarded as conclusive.

There are the groups who believe in heredity and nurture. Nurture is a generic term. It need not mean much, and it may include everything except conception and its deterministic mechanisms. Personally, I am not sure just where heredity begins and environment ends. I can't see that this line is artificially and rigidly drawn save for purposes of study and investigation. The environment of the now may be the heredity of the hereafter—I do not know. It is possible. At any rate, man has acquired a host of characteristics and potentials—whether by heredity or habit training, I do not know, although most scientists believe that acquired characteristics cannot be inherited.

On the other hand, there are numerous groups in the community that are stressing special determinisms. They are building up theories, each group giving emphasis as though its own theory were all conclusive. To illustrate, Davenport, one of our best geneticists, writes: "Committing crimes or misdemeanors is the reaction of the inherited plasm to external stimuli, just as the moth flies to the candle, the carrion fly to the source of the scent, so such persons perform their acts as part of necessary reactions." (That is deterministic.) "Sincerity, insincerity, generosity or stinginess, truthfulness or untruthfulness are all qualities whose presence or absence is determined largely by the factor of heredity." By way of contrast, Dr. Kil-

patrick, who is viewing life from another angle states that social inheritance is more important than physical heredity. So you can take your choice.

This simply serves to indicate that there remains ample field for investigation and discovery. I have no quarrel with any point of view, but we must be on guard against unproved theories and all so-called conclusive doctrines. The more that is claimed for a definite system of any description, the more freely should it be challenged. There should not be the ready acceptance of doctrinaire ideas simply on authority.

Dr. Baldwin has referred to the preschool experiments that he is supervising as a part of the important study of life and of a particular period of life. Childhood's greatest importance to us as social beings resides in the fact that childhood is the period of preparation for the development of adolescence, which leads out into the further developments of maturity. It is the age during which a child is learning his various worlds, meeting and absorbing reality, cultivating imagination and reasoning, becoming familiar with his own impulses, feelings, motives, reactions, and is building up sentiments, attitudes, desires, and interests in terms of self-satisfaction and is endeavoring to reconcile them with parental demands, communal compulsions, customs, and mores.

It is the development period for an expansion of the ego through its contraction. This sounds paradoxical, but it represents the idea of my "I" becoming smaller, so far as I as a person am concerned, and larger so far as my world is concerned. It typifies the socialization of an individual. During a long period of years the child is dipping constantly into the shallows and depths of the stream of

world-consciousness. He is experimenting with life and trying to adjust his single, living personality with a universal personality which some people term the spirit of life, and others the evidence of God.

Childhood is significant to the extent that it reveals some of the potentials that are said to be in the egg, but it affords us a time span during which we must provide a proper incubating environment for its growth and development, we must supply the material, the place, and the protection requisite to insure the various moltings and the formation of habits throughout the crawling, larval stage. It is our responsibility to afford right conditions for preserving energy, for enlarging and interpreting experience so as to provide the substance for the development in the pupal or adolescent stage. Society looks hopefully for the emergence of an efficient, useful, contented, rational, social being. The adult cannot rise above the levels inherent in the egg, but his traits, tendencies, activities, and outlook are constantly subject to limitation and to changes prior to and even after maturity. It becomes all the more important, therefore, that we should exercise some critical analysis in our interpretation of the facts and experiences of childhood.

Emerson wisely remarked, "I am always environed by myself." I create my own environment. I shall not go into the theory of noumenalism and phenomenalism, but my environment is partly a reflection of my contact with the world about me, my touch with it, my perception of it, my interpretation of it. I live in the world that I create for myself; in a world accepted, rejected or modified by me. The history of man has been bound up in ideas, and in changes of ideas. Each age believes itself the posses-

sor of the best ideas and has strong convictions concerning the rationality of its own processes. Yet few ideas of man have been static. Few ideas have withstood the flight of time without modification. The gods of yesterday often become the evil spirits of tomorrow. But man ever seeks for short-cuts, panaceas, universal laws, and he is wont to generalize from particulars. He is wont to rationalize rather than to be rational. His tendency is to explain things to his own satisfaction instead of applying cool, calm logic and deliberate thought to an analysis of his problems.

In the recent development of interest in childhood the critical attitude is more imperative than ever, because we must make distinction between assumptions and facts, facts and relationships, relationships and causality. Today we have causality and finality and banality frequently linked together. Assumptions are accepted all too frequently as facts, and elaborate systems are built thereon.

The child is too often interpreted as a pocket edition of an adult, and is oriented and judged in terms of adult standards, principles, and experiences. In reality, the child lives in a world that is not a child's world, a world that molds him before he is an integral part of it. Hence, both the child and his world deserve analysis.

It has ever been man's wont to extract truth from and by generalizations. It is not so many years ago since astrology determined human destiny. The sun, moon, and stars exerted their direct influence on men and nations. One needed only a horoscope to determine the destiny of his own individual life or that of his offspring. But astrology led to astronomy.

It is not so many centuries ago that Pythagoras con-

sidered earth, air, fire, and water properly combined the requisite for health. The Romans prided themselves on their superiority and accounted for it on the basis of their geographic location. Thus we might recount many concepts of climatic influences that have come and gone. Indeed, many of us can remember that a generation ago the second summer was deemed very dangerous for infants. I know that some of the younger ones present were living through that dangerous second summer, and they cannot realize the anxiety of their mothers. Some of you laugh at that, yet within your time when there was an epidemic of infantile paralysis, there was just as much ignorance, fear, and hysterical anxiety. There was little rationality. Fear had seized the whole multitude and for a time many people went back to a belief in demoniac possession, and others reverted to wearing camphor bags around their necks as amulets. How many people now living have worn bags of asafetida around the neck, and how many still believe that red flannel is good for rheumatism? How many pin their faith to horse chestnuts carried in their pockets? Yet those were current practiced doctrines and beliefs of a generation ago; and some of them, despite their unscientific nature, have not yet been completely rejected. They may appear humorous because they are not as common as they were. But they once had a social sanction.

It is popular to ascribe as much as possible to heredity. It appears satisfying to many to attribute everything to it. It saves us from all responsibility, and throws it back upon our ancestors. "It is in the blood—too bad—can't do anything about it—like his grandfather on his father's side." If it is a desirable trait perhaps it comes from the grandmother on the mother's side. In other

words we accept a phase of incomplete scientific investigation as though it were dogmatic and absolute, determining without any question the lives of our children. Heredity has been held responsible for almost everything—blindness, syphilis, feeble-mindedness, nervous and mental diseases, traits, and dispositions, abilities and disabilities, moral and immoral habits and characteristics, social status, and what not. And yet Dr. Gesell has the temerity to say that he regards biology as important but not a dominant feature. Jennings goes a bit farther and says, "More properly, characteristics are not inherited at all; what one inherits is certain material that under certain conditions will produce certain characteristics; if the conditions are not supplied some other characteristic is produced." What could be more explicit? If things turn out as they turn out, they turn out that way; if they do not, they do not. I might continue to analyze this hereditary, biologic determinism and accept it as the excuse and explanation for much still undetermined. Biology with its data on heredity, Mendelianism, and eugenic selection possesses undeniable importance as a science, but to regard it today as a complete determinism is contrary to the facts thus far established.

There is another determinism which is very popular today—endocrinology. Naccarati and Garrett go so far as to show that the ratio of the arms and legs to the trunk is related to emotional and intellectual life, and that these are determined by the action of the endocrine. This endocrine relation has not been actually established. Do you believe that Napoleon was a failure because his pituitary gland broke down? Do you believe that Theodore Roosevelt was such an unusually fine parent because he pos-

sessed excellent adrenal glands? Yet these are specific allegations that have been made by endocrinologists. Of course Napoleon was dead and so was Roosevelt at the time that these endocrinologic explanations were made with fanatic assurance. Life is not all physics and chemistry. Dunham states, "The vegetative nervous system and the endocrine organs reacting involuntarily to physico-chemical stimuli automatically produce the phenomena of behavior while the unique analysers of the brain attempt to control inharmonious tendencies by the voluntary organization of conduct according to cultural standards." But life is more than endocrines; life is more than thyroids and adrenals and thymuses, useful as they are. The study of these ductless gland systems may add some contribution to our knowledge, but most of present-day endocrinological determinism reveals a wide use of the imagination, dependence on speculation, and an overdeveloped enthusiasm for creating a fantastic hypothetic world in which the endocrinologist at least deems his theories safe from attack.

I doubt whether you are all willing to believe that all of life, will, intelligence, emotions, spirit, artistry, ingenuity, initiative, spontaneity, pugnacity, or reticence are determined solely by some one gland or a small group of glands whose bodily function is still undetermined. Nor is it known how or why they are set in motion. If the endocrines regulate the body, what regulates the endocrines? Physics and chemistry do not answer that question; and physics and chemistry from an endocrinological standpoint cannot solve and do not solve many of the problems of human life or the vagaries of human behavior.

There are numerous factors in the environment which

exert significant temporary or permanent pressures. I recognize the effects of the physical environment, the pressures for food, and the stresses of climate that affect growth and disposition. These admittedly influence our thoughts and our activities. Their effects are given less attention than is bestowed upon the psychological determinism known as behaviorism.

Dr. Watson has propounded an interesting and arresting psychological theory. It is convenient to reduce life and its reactions to conditioned reflexes, but character consists of more than reflexes. Practically, life and behavior cannot be analyzed into their component reflexes. I should like to hear Dr. Baldwin interpret the actions of the two-year-old child who tried to throw its arms around another two-year-old child in terms of reflexes. The conditioned reflexes which initiated that particular form of motor expression baffle analysis. Life, growth, thought, speech, are not merely matters of subvocal muscular activity. Behaviorism has made a contribution to our thoughts upon habits and training, but it has not disclosed the foundations of character. Behaviorism takes no cognizance of ethics, of religion, of spirituality, of a soul; it is thoroughly mechanistic. At the present time a determinism that bereaves us of all of these values which enrich life has to be very carefully scrutinized while we try to interpret its deterministic implications for the growing generation.

I now approach another school of determinism which lays its emphasis upon a psychical phase of life. There is a vigorous, almost militant group that claims that the determinisms of life are resident in the intellect. I am not so sure that the intellect can be definitely located, but wher-

ever it is, it is the vital instrument in fashioning and determining the quality and quantity of life. The intellect within its limitations determines sensation, perception, ideation; it indicates our potentalities; it forecasts to some extent our vocational trends and aptitudes. Nevertheless one dare not assume that genius will perform in accord with its promise. High intellectual power is not a deterministic factor, though it is assuredly an important factor in the life of the child. As Dr. Baldwin remarked, merely to know the I.Q. is insufficient. The I.Q. may be high and the character quotient may be low or the I.Q. may be low and the character quotient may be high. So many emotional and social elements enter into the value of the intellect that Dunlap has even raised the question as to whether we should breed through genius or around genius. There is reason to give serious thought to Goddard's comment: "Responsibility varies according to the intelligence." The ardent believers in this intellect determinism are satisfied to account for much of truancy, laziness, pauperism, delinquency, and crime on the simple basis of intellectual inferiority. Their view is illustrated by the statement, "We may say that every feeble-minded person is a potential drunkard." Shades of our forefathers!

If we go behind the intellectual determinists we come to those who stress the instincts and impulses. They offer a tremendous group of determinisms. They deal with both the hereditary and acquired characteristics of our instincts and emotions. Whether the emotions be regarded as the feeling phase of instincts or as the cores of complexes is immaterial. While practically all groups build up subconscious realms we have distinguishable theories. Some expound a doctrine based upon a belief in a collec-

tive consciousness, others express their views in terms of organic inferiority. Both interpret with confidence the nature and development of the desires and wishes, sentiments and interests in values, which theoretically should have tremendous import for later life. Are the proponents of these theories dealing with basic facts or with assumptions? Are their theories founded upon proved, demonstrable, tangible work or evidence, or are they outgrowths of philosophic thinking? They have grown out of thought and assumptions; and the assumptions have been forgotten while the system of thought has remained. Many of the postulated premises have not been examined for many years. If the premises are unfounded the structure raised upon them is not proof against attack.

Childhood with its self-assertion lacks the experimental background for weighing realities. The instincts are said to be the powerful determiners for meeting life-situations. Some believe in one instinct, as Freud formerly did; some believe in several; some believe in many. One's viewpoint determines a belief in four, fifty-seven, or more. The number may be immaterial, but it is important whether one accepts unquestioningly the underlying thinking in terms of Freud, or Watson, or McDougall, or Thorndike. Which one of them is correct beyond a doubt? Their work involves taking apart something intangible for purposes of study and analysis. Their doctrines do not call for immediate wholesale adoption and application to every phase of daily life.

At the present time many mothers are anxious lest they foster the development of unconscious conflicts in their children—conflicts that might dominate their lives and ruin them. Introspective psychology has endangered

the peace of homes because undue popularization has thwarted reason and judgment. As a matter of fact there is a great question as to how much conflict in child life is of the pattern alleged and urged by Freud. Dr. Freud claims that the child's onanism from suckling, his sexual curiosity, with all the implications of the castration complex and the Oedipus complex are to form the basis of his future thought and action. Such subconscious motivation developed during infancy and childhood is assumed by the leader of the psychoanalytic school, whose work has been mainly with neurotic adults, and not with normal children. Dr. William Stern, however, a leading spirit in genetic psychology, referring to this dogmatic position remarks, "The unprejudiced observation of healthy children gives no support to this assertion."

The Freudian philosophy and practice during the past few years, although a very valuable contribution, have been responsible for much harm because people have not recognized that, while it originated a system for explaining and meeting the problems of neurotic adults, it has been applied to phases of infantile and juvenile development. Its foundations do not rest upon established or accepted facts that warrant its deterministic claims. It has not been proved that dreams are wish fulfilments; it has not been proved that fears arise from hidden impulses of an undesirable sort; it has not been proved that children are trying to repress and control memories. Nor has it been proved that chorea (St. Vitus' dance) represents a regression to the time that a child is struggling to be born, as claimed by Dr. Rank. And yet that is sound doctrine to those who believe it.

Are you willing to accept, as proved, the theory that

rhyme-making by little children is erotic excitation? Do you accept as fact that your child, when playing with plasticine and molding clay and trying to be a sculptor, is merely giving evidence of coprophilic instinct? Do you believe that an underlying infantile interest in the phenomena of defecation is the actual basis of his later thrift? These concepts form part of the orthodox theory that demands recognition as a psychic determinism. Who is prepared to accept as truth the implications of this sentence in *A Study of the Mental Life of the Child?* "Indeed it is not going too far to search for the basis of everything that goes wrong with a child, in his own sexual life, or that of the persons with whom he has to do." I have called the psychoanalytic theories a determinism, and I derive my greatest support from Rank's statement "Psycho-analysis has shown the strict determinism that rules in the psychic life."

This is just another example of our seizing an idea and swallowing it without knowing whether it has been properly cooked or prepared, whether it is safe or sanitary, or whether it contains the nutrients we need. It is an unbalanced psychologic diet for parents and others feeding the minds of children.

I must not overlook the social determinisms involving social compulsions of many kinds. I know that familial and communal wealth and health, companionships and social status, knowledge of aesthetics and ethical codes are all things which help to determine childhood. The social sanctions are forces, but they are not the sole determiners. The social pressures and compulsions are profoundly important, through direct and indirect suggestion, in formulating the habits, traits, and ideals of growing children.

Such an excellent sociologist as Ellwood, however, does not believe in a complete social determinism of individual behavior, because he remarks, "Man develops his variations physically and mentally."

I might go on and enumerate determinism after determinism, such as the stimulations and inhibitions through the interactions of man as his own environing force. We are all familiar with economic determinism—the Marxian philosophy in which man becomes a passive agent upon whom is visited all the disturbances of the economic system. Few concede that man is simply a passive reflex of his environment. I might discuss child-development, through moral and ethical determinisms; or in terms of theological determinisms, with ideas of original sin, fear of God, and a future life; or in terms of governmental determinisms and the laws of loyalty. All hold intrenched positions as determinisms.

Childhood is a period of the growth of the mind, a period for the development and integration of the entire child, who functions as a whole, and not with one part at a time. He is integrated functionally, and thus is a psycho-biologic unit. To focus attention upon any one part of his organization is helpful only for purposes of scientific investigation, but then every ascertained fact must be related to all the other known facts in order to learn its deterministic values.

To recapitulate, childhood is not subject to a single determinism, but multiple determinisms are constantly at work. Intellectual, physical, emotional, and social forces, however subdivided or named, are mutually interacting and effective determinisms. The especial importance of childhood lies in the fact that it embraces the period of the

summation of all of these determinisms which constitute and delimit the personality that is ever struggling to determine for itself. In fine, the simple truth is expressed in the words of E. R. Downing: "The destiny of the individual is the resultant of heredity (what he is), environment (what he has), and training (what he does), and no one element can be omitted in calculating the result." Hence, all the determinisms of childhood are real, but no one is *the* reality. Life is personality, life is experience, and life is environment.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION: RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES IN NURSERY SCHOOLS

RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES IN NURSERY SCHOOLS

The group interested in Research Possibilities in Nursery Schools met at 1:30 immediately following the luncheon, Mrs. Alfred S. Alschuler, Staff Director of Franklin Nursery School, presiding.

CHAIRMAN ALSCHULER: Just a week ago, a number of us who are gathered here today met in Washington for the first national conference of nursery school workers ever held. It was, I think, rather astonishing to us to realize ourselves as an educational group, and to know that we were recognized, because not more than four or five years ago we as individual nursery school workers had to be possessed of great faith—almost of audacity—to acknowledge ourselves as nursery school workers.

That we were taking the young child away from its home where it belonged and that we were relieving the mother of too much responsibility were some of the charges made against us. Meantime the movement has grown with astonishing rapidity and now we are fearful that it may grow so quickly that it will be crystallized before it has been properly defined. We are convinced that children are benefitted, that they are stabilized and better developed in coming to us, but we are still trying to find out many things about our program. How much and what kinds of activity should young children have? How much intellectual stimulus and content is desirable? What elements

make for soundest physical development? We are quizzing ourselves about all of these things. We are quite certain that it is advantageous for children to have some sort of group experience, but we do not know how much program and group life is altogether beneficial. We know comparatively little as yet about the responses of very young children to rhythm; we are trying to learn something about their responses and reactions to each other and to various types of equipment. All of these things are being watched and noted in a number of nursery schools in as many different ways. It is for that reason that we thought it would be interesting today, to discuss some of the research possibilities in nursery school work.

One of the most interesting aspects of the Conference in Washington was descriptions given of different types of nursery schools operating under different conditions. Practically everyone is trying to discover and develop material along different lines. Dr. Bird T. Baldwin reported that in the Preschool Laboratories at Iowa State University, where he is directing that work, careful charts are being made of norms as they find them of physical and mental development. Here in Chicago we have a number of nursery schools making different approaches to nursery school needs. But we will take as a basis of discussion today the work going on in one school, the Franklin Nursery School, unique perhaps because it is in a public school, because its entire program—eating, sleeping, and playing—is carried on in one room 28×30 feet in size, and because it is peculiarly fortunate in being able to do a piece of careful scientific work by co-operating with existent agencies who in turn use the nursery school

as a source of scientific data. The physical health work is under the direction of the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund, and the mental health program is in the hands of the Institute for Juvenile Research.

I think first we should like to hear from Miss Mary Murphy. Many of you know the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund as one of the strong social constructive forces in the city. However, none of you who has not had the joy of working with them could know the beauty and the value of the kind of co-operation which they give, nor could you know of the care with which they develop and execute their plans from day to day and month to month.

It is with great pleasure that I introduce to you Miss Mary Murphy, Director of the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund.

PHYSICAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Mary E. Murphy, Director, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund

The Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund has as its part of the program at the Franklin Nursery School the phases relating to the physical care of the children. This does not include the daily inspection for contagious diseases, this service being rendered by the Department of Health. The work of the Fund includes the regular supervision of the children by a pediatrician and a nutrition specialist, together with a supervision of the dietary and the education of the parents in regard to the care of their children.

Each child is given a complete physical examination, the mother being present. An examination is never given

except in the presence of one of the parents, since it is believed that the educational factor in such an examination plays a large part in the point of view which the parent must have in order to maintain health in the child. The physician not only gives the original examination, but checks regularly on the condition of the child.

The children of the nursery school are weighed each week by the nutrition specialist in charge, and are measured each month for standing height, sitting height, and arm span. In addition to the regular contact with the parent and child at the time of the examination, there has been established a monthly conference with the mother, a regular appointment being made, with ample time provided for a satisfactory discussion of the child's progress and needs. The pediatrician, the nutrition specialist, and the educational director of the school attend this conference, which has as its chief objective the welfare of the child.

In addition, the homes are visited and instruction given to the mother on the program which should be followed in the home. Full information as to what food is provided for the child at home, what are the hours of sleep and the home's program of activity, is recorded as a basis for recommendations to the mother.

The nursery-school program includes feedings of cod-liver oil and orange juice in the mid-morning, and half a pint of milk and one graham cracker in the afternoon, and a dinner served at noon. The nutrition specialist in charge has planned the menus, the preparation of which is carried out in the kitchen of the regular school.

The Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund in its connection with this nursery school has two interests: first, a

service to the children and the promotion of education among parents on the physical care of children, and, second, research. The results of such research, conducted among so limited a number of children, are of value chiefly as they offer themselves as a contribution to larger studies. We are interested in keeping very careful data, so that our knowledge of the physical development of the young child may gain through the contact provided in the nursery school.

We also are aware of the interrelationship of the physical condition and the mental and emotional phases of the child's development, and any consideration of the child's response to his environment and to the program provided as expressed in physical development must include these factors. Since, however, this particular phase of the program at the nursery school is in charge of the Institute for Juvenile Research and will be reported later by Miss Kawin, we shall confine ourselves to consideration of the opportunities for study in the physical field alone.

Because we feel that the record of growth is a rich source of study, very careful measurements are being taken and detailed records kept. Such a growth record has, I believe, a two-fold significance. Data collected regularly over a long period of time should be of value in setting up more accurate standards of growth than those yet available. Moreover, using our present standards as an approximation of the progress a child should make, the data assembled in the nursery school are full of possibilities. The effectiveness of a balanced program of activity and rest, of interests and equipment adapted to the child's needs, and a dietary provided at the school assumed to be adequate, is being studied in the Franklin Nursery School

in terms of physical growth, as recorded in careful measurements, and in the physical condition as noted by the periodic examination of the pediatrician. Furthermore, the relationship between the record of growth and the findings of the pediatrician should furnish a contribution to a study of the value of growth measurements as an index of a child's health.

The service, which includes the early detection of defects and their correction, establishment of good nutrition and of health habits conducive to proper development, with careful education of the home, cannot be adequately measured in terms of the physical development of the child during the limited period of the child's stay in the nursery school. Further studies are planned of these children over a period of years, with controls selected from among school children who have not had the program provided in the nursery school. We plan to follow these children long enough to determine, if possible, whether the early dental care and other corrections, the establishment of nutrition, good habits of sleep, food, and activity will show results in physical well-being.

We hope also that the studies of these children may become contributions to other data being assembled by our own organization and others interested in child development which will help to erect more adequate standards than now exist, according to age, of physical development and physical performance.

The great possibilities of the nursery school lie, we feel, not only in the social and educational service, but in the field of research, which offers opportunities to work for even broader and more lasting results.

CHAIRMAN ALSCHULER: As Miss Murphy has said we in our school situation are not at the present moment trying to demonstrate or reveal any one thing, as, for example, at Columbia University in Miss Hill's department, motor and language responses of very young children are being noted at six months intervals. I have asked Miss Hill and some of the other participants of this morning's program to lead the discussion after Miss Kawin has talked. Miss Ethel Kawin, our next speaker, is known to many of you through her work in Chicago in the vocational division of the Board of Education. She has within the past year associated herself with the Institute for Juvenile Research. She is in charge of the Nursery School Research Program, which is in process of development. Dr. Herman Adler, Director of the Institute, recently remarked to me that he considered the addition of Miss Kawin to their staff one of the finest things that had happened at the Institute for some time.

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Ethel Kawin, Director, Preschool Research, Institute of Juvenile Research

Dr. Baldwin told you this morning, I think, that they regard their preschool laboratories in Iowa almost as a preschool child itself, just learning to toddle. If the work they are doing in Iowa may be called a preschool child, I am afraid that the project which I am going to try to describe to you briefly might almost be said to be still in the prenatal stage, because we have been functioning just two months.

Ernest D. Burton, late president of the University of

Chicago, once defined research as "pushing the boundaries of our knowledge out a little farther over the vast wilderness of our ignorance." This vivid and stimulating description which defines research as a great adventure into the land of the unknown is especially applicable to the field of human behavior.

Man's search for self-understanding and self-mastery is as old as the soothsayers, but, from the standpoint of actual scientific knowledge, the area of the known is a very, very tiny realm, a mere speck in comparison with the vast areas that remain to be explored. It is in this spirit of trying to push the boundaries of knowledge out a little farther over the vast wilderness of ignorance that the Institute for Juvenile Research has, within the past few months, set up a research station in connection with work for the preschool child and the nursery-school child.

I am going to try to describe to you very briefly the nature of our set-up and how we came to be in existence.

It happened that this past autumn the Institute for Juvenile Research, which, as most of you know, is a state organization of which Dr. Herman Adler is the director, received requests from four different nursery schools simultaneously, asking us for psychological and psychiatric service in their schools.

We considered the matter very carefully, and, inasmuch as the demand seemed to be such a community demand, and the Institute tries to serve all citizens of the state as much as possible in their requests for service, Dr. Adler decided we would set up a special division of research for the preschool child, and assigned to me the privilege of organizing this branch of work.

We are working in three nursery schools; we have

been sorry not to be able to answer the requests of other nursery schools for service, but, for the first six months we felt that was all we should undertake, in order to do a fairly thorough job.

The three schools are the Children's Community School, the Franklin School, which you have already heard about as the first nursery school in a public school, and the nursery school at Hull-House, which is run by the National Kindergarten and Elementary College.

The Institute for Juvenile Research has, through the generous invitation of Miss Jane Addams, headquarters at Hull-House. We have there conference rooms and offices, a children's playroom where children may be brought for observed play, and a room for mental-testing and psychiatric examination.

What we feel is particularly unique about the set-up we have at Hull-House is the fact that the Mary Crane Nursery Building, where our headquarters are located, is a unit building for, primarily, *well* children. I mean it is not at all in the nature of a dispensary, but Hull-House devotes that building to the welfare of children, and we are a unit of co-operating organizations that have existed in the community for work with children.

The National Kindergarten College, which is the educational organization, is operating the nursery school. The physical examinations are done by the Infant Welfare Society, and they are also doing nutritional work for children from the ages of two to six. The nutritional work for children over six is being done by the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund which Miss Murphy represents, and we, the Institute for Juvenile Research, are organizing the psychiatric and psychological work.

So far as we know, that is a slightly different set-up from that existing anywhere else in a nursery-school research station, and what we are particularly hoping that we may demonstrate here is the possibility of co-operative research for children being done by the civic and community agencies already in existence in a well-organized community.

I am going to skip over a description of our staff, because in this limited time that would not be of great interest to you, except to mention that we have the part-time of a psychiatrist; we have two psychologists, one of them part-time, a psychiatric social worker, and a worker especially trained for nursery-school work. The service which we are rendering in the schools consists of psychological examinations, a psychiatric examination where it seems advisable, and, in addition, especial observation of behavior problems wherever the need seems apparent. But it is not particularly on the service end of our work that I am talking to you today, and, as research really is our major objective, I shall go on briefly to describe what we are hoping to do in the way of research work.

Our main interest, of course, is the psychological and psychiatric research. We are giving every child in these nursery schools an intelligence test. We are using the Stanford-Binet, first, for children of three years of age and over; the Kuhlman-Binet for children under three. We hope after that program to go on and carry out the tests worked out at the Merrill Palmer School by Dr. Stutsman for preschool children, and, after that to use the Gesell tests, the Detroit kindergarten tests, and the Pintner-Patterson and others adapted to young children.

What I would like to bring out particularly is that

we are not interested in using intelligence tests in order to learn the I.Q. of the child alone. We are trying to use the intelligence tests analytically. I shall illustrate briefly by one or two case illustrations.

We are trying to bring out through our Stanford-Binet test the special defects and special abilities of the child (with the hope, of course, that we can help him to overcome the disabilities).

For example, one of the children I tested recently was an especially interesting contrast in his low ability on the language tests and his high ability on the performance tests. Whenever we came to a part of the test that required language or vocabulary for the answer, he got panicky and came out with a painful wail, "Miss Kawin, I don't know! But I don't know! Miss Kawin!"

One might have an idea, from that, that the child was, perhaps, slightly retarded, but, on the other hand, when he came to the level where he was required to count thirteen pennies, I laid them out, and, quick as a flash he counted all the way up to thirteen, and then, without a moment's hesitation came out with this, "And eleven of them are Indians, and two are Lincolns!" No child that I had ever tested had made that observation, and it had not occurred to me to notice whether I laid out Lincoln or Indian pennies.

We also hope that we can do some studies of the reactions of children to intelligence testing in so far as the intelligence tests indicate important personality traits. One of the things we have under way now is a study of the way the individual child reacts when he reaches that part of the intelligence test which begins to be too difficult for him and which he cannot do. I believe, and I think there

are many people who believe, that there we may get at one of the basic traits of human character, and one of the most helpful indications of the problem to which we must help the child adjust for his future satisfaction in life. Most of us adults who fail here and there fail because we are not able to meet problem situations satisfactorily. Now, how does the child meet the problem when he comes to the point where he no longer can perform the task?

A week or so ago I had a startling contrast of that sort presented in two children. There was a delightful boy in our Franklin Nursery School who is a combination of Japanese and Irish—a very intelligent youngster. When he came to those parts of the intelligence test where he could not answer the questions, he said, in a perfectly straightforward adult manner, "I don't know, my father never taught me that," or "I don't know, I haven't learned that." Or, where he was supposed to draw something—some figure—he would say, "I don't understand how that was made." He didn't bluff, he didn't shrink. He came forward and, in a straight, matter-of-fact way, said, "I don't know."

The next child whom I tested, began, when he came to the difficult things, to whimper and grow restless, to want to go back to the Nursery School room and, finally, to begin to cry and want his "mama." I looked at the clock and noticed it was nearly luncheon time, and I thought it might be possible he was tired and hungry, so I quieted him and went back to some of the easier things that I thought he could do. Immediately, he was all smiles and co-operation, thereby indicating quite clearly that it was not just fatigue and hunger. When I turned back to the difficult things, he again began to cry and want his mother.

It is that sort of a personality reaction that seems to me one of the significant things to be learned from the analytic use of the intelligence test. It is our problem to teach that child to meet life in some other way instead of whimpering and wanting his mother when he comes to the difficult situations.

We are hoping to make studies of the emotional reactions of the young child. But that is a very difficult field in which to formulate scientific research problems, and we are going at it very slowly. We have been much interested in the research material put out by the University of Iowa Welfare Research Station, and hope to organize something that will be similarly valuable in indicating these early emotional reactions. We are particularly interested, therefore, in studying children in conflict situations, partly because we are interested in the Dewey theory that emotion is a product of a conflict situation, and partly because we think that the way of meeting such problem situations is a very important part of the child's personality, as I have indicated.

We hope to study the children in controlled conflict situations which we shall create in our laboratory and in the natural conflict situations that arise in the course of a nursery-school day. We are interested in various kinds of conflict: the kind of conflict the child has with authority, the kind that the child has with his own desire as conflicting with his own inadequacy or incapacity to carry out that desire, the conflict of two conflicting desires in the child's own nature, and then, perhaps, in the conflict of the child's desire with the desire of another child. We are at present doing a preliminary investigation on emotional situations in the hope that out of those we may be able to

formulate a research problem. We have our workers in the nursery schools writing objective descriptions of the outbursts of emotion that appear in the children quite spontaneously, temper and sulking, etc., and then attempting to describe the situation (in so far as it has been observable), which seemed to be producing that reaction.

We are hoping to do some studies in the value of free play, and the children's reactions in free play, and to study children in our controlled-play room, playing by themselves in free play, and then each child playing with every other child one by one in the nursery school to see if we can get observations on the way children react in pairs, that is, to see how each child in the school reacts when he is playing individually with every other child in the school, to see what are the reactions of these different personalities on each other.

There is so much that one might talk about, it is very hard to choose the subjects for a brief talk like this, but perhaps in closing I would best skip more of the detail of our own work, or the things we hope to do in the line of physiological and nutritional research, as Miss Murphy has indicated, and mention briefly three things that we hope in the future to do: We would like very much to be able to help the nursery schools prove their own *techniques* from the standpoint of scientific research—questions that bother them in the organization of their daily program. For instance, how much relaxation should the children have, and what is the value of relaxation? What are the symptoms of fatigue? What are the symptoms of overstimulation, if there is such a thing? That is the type of problem we hope to help them with, but it is very difficult to formulate those into problems that can be scien-

tifically studied, and we therefore feel that will have to be a matter of development that will take some time.

We are also hoping to organize centers for students' training. We already have some of the kindergarten students coming to us, for occasional lectures and observation, and we hope, in the future, to have a center for parent education. We feel what we are learning in our research on children should be available for mothers as soon as we can make it so. Thirdly, we hope to have there at Hull-House a research center in which people in all fields of work that bear directly on the preschool child will come and conduct independent scientific research studies so that co-operatively we may gain more and more knowledge about this preschool child, about whom so little as yet is known.

Chairman Alschuler: We have a very few moments left for discussion. You have, I am sure, realized some of the needs and values of the kind of co-operation we are getting through these agencies, and you have had perhaps a little indication of some of the fun we are having in finding out about young children. Last week in Washington, Miss Hill may remember, I regretted that we had no opportunity to talk about differences in techniques, procedures, objectives, and programs. In the brief time now remaining, I think we should like to hear something about other research programs. Miss Hill, would you tell us of the work going forward along this line in your Nursery School at Teacher's College, New York?

Miss Patty Smith Hill: I wish very much that the people who had charge of the research could report to you instead of my attempting to do so. Dr. Bess Cunningham

has been our chairman since 1923. We had to sneak in the first nursery school we ever had. The authorities would never in the world have consented to letting two-year-old babies get in. The first year we acted just on common sense and did not try to do any research. We kept the children out of doors as much as possible in care of the teacher in our kindergarten who had shown the greatest aptitude with younger children. Then, as we felt we wanted to learn everything England could teach us, we invited Miss Grace Owens to come to us.

Then it was that we began regular research. I shall speak of just one project as I believe the data on the weighing and measuring of children and all of the physical examinations have been reported. We have gotten most interesting material along the line of nutrition, on the importance of the egg in a child's diet; it is not yet complete. Dr. Rose who has conducted the experiment is more and more convinced of the importance of an egg a day in keeping certain forms of disease away from children. I really dare not undertake to speak for our research workers. We are, however, I might mention, tremendously interested in the effect of language approval given to children on improvement. Mrs. Waring, who is working out her doctor's dissertation along this line, has planned certain types of work with children in the kindergarten, and grade, in which one group of children, when they make a success, have to get the whole sense of satisfaction out of their own knowledge that the thing is successful. The child draws his own conclusions, and nothing is said.

In the other group, when the child makes a satisfactory response, the teacher says, "That is good" or "That is right," giving a word of encouragement, and, as far as that research has gone (it is not complete, the dissertation is not yet written, though it is in the process of being written), we have been greatly impressed with the more rapid improvement from the children who have the commendation of other people on their efforts to succeed. Now, the other lines of research, as I say, I couldn't touch upon; they are too numerous, but I thought that one was a little unique, and so gave it.

CHAIRMAN ALSCHULER: I wonder if Dr. Baldwin would speak to us. We appreciate hearing from Dr. Hill, and I think reports along these lines are stimulating and enlightening. Dr. Baldwin, will you talk to us?

DR. BALDWIN: Perhaps during these few minutes I might suggest some of the studies that we have completed, because those studies are available, or will be, very shortly, and might be used to suggest other lines of attack.

We have six studies that are now completed; the first one is an analytic study of the child entering school. This was our first preschool study, psychological study, and was made about five years ago. That study has been published.

Another study was on the aesthetic development of preschool children by Dr. Wiegel. That study is now available, dealing with the constructive ability of young children. The first one, and the one that the speaker referred to, is on the emotional development of preschool children, a study of introversion and extraversion by Dr. Marsdens. That study is very suggestive. It contains outlines for breaking emotional reactions, and is available.

Another study is on the motor control and the motor development of the school children. Dr. Welland made some sixteen to twenty thousand observations on the control of the hand and arm of children between the ages of two and five years, and her studies are now ready to go to press.

Another study was on language development, by Dr. Smith. She made an intense study of the vocabularies of children, and found that on an average, our two-year-old children use about two hundred words, while the six-year-old children use twenty-five hundred. These are the averages; some use more, some less; but she has worked out a scale for checking the vocabulary of preschool children, and the last one, which is now going to press, is on the learning of preschool children. Dr. Kirkwood has completed her investigations on how children learn in a substitution test, and has rechecked learning after the lapse of one year and two years.

CHAIRMAN ALSCHULER: We are suffering from an embarrassment of riches and a lack of time. We have Miss Edna White here, Director of the Merrill Palmer Foundation which has been so generous and helpful to all of us who have started schools since the opening of their nursery school. Had we more time we should have been so glad to hear from her and from Dr. Ira Wile. But I think we shall have to adjourn.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION: SEX EDUCATION

SEX EDUCATION

The Luncheon Round Table Discussion on Sex Education convened at 1:15 P.M., Miss Helen Myrick presiding.

CHAIRMAN MYRICK: Will the meeting please come to order. We will talk from 1:15 to 2:15, and as an introduction to the speakers, I wish to explain that I am with the Illinois Society for Mental Hygiene; therefore, I am going to say a few words about mental hygiene and sex education.

A basic principle of mental hygiene is the prevention of conflict between one's emotional, intellectual and social attitudes. Sex, of course, is one of the most potent factors in one's life. A successful adjustment in this phase is of the utmost importance to one's mental hygiene. Through knowledge comes help, but it is not the knowledge alone, but the *way* in which one attains knowledge that is essential to the development of a constructive attitude; therefore, this program on sex education stresses the method of teaching.

The first speaker is Mrs. Sidonie Gruenberg, Director, Child Study Association of America.

SEX EDUCATION VERSUS SEX INFORMATION

Mrs. Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg, Director,
National Child Study Association

It is unfortunate that "sex education" has assumed in the public mind the standing of a fad, regarding which

one asks, "Do you believe in this or that?" We are not called upon to believe in sex education, for it is as old as the race, and we cannot get away from it because of two inescapable facts. The first of these is the fact that human beings come always and everywhere as male and female. The second is the fact that human infants pick up their education from what goes on around them. Whether we mean it so or not, our children have in most cases acquired a very substantial, and often a permanent, education regarding sex attitudes, sex ideals, the place of sex in life, sex morality before they are well in their teens.

This education has not been, to be sure, a planned or purposeful guidance in important values and understanding. Indeed, for most children it has been largely built up by our eloquent silences, our misdirections, our evasions and concealments. Sex has become shameful because it has been hidden; it has become low because we have cast our eyes down at its mention; it has become nasty because we have treated it as unspeakable. All that, together with a vast body of impossible anatomy and weird physiology, has been the education arising from our negative and fearful refusal to deal with realities. In proposing sex education we have to consider what kind we are to have, not whether we are to have any.

Sex education begins even before the child begins to talk, whereas sex instruction must wait until there is already a substantial vocabulary. The child learns a great deal about relations of the members of the family to one another, their attitude, their affections, their deferences, their considerations. He gradually acquires certain standards in regard to way of living and certain values and appreciations. And he comes to have ideals as to what is

worthy or as to what is reprehensible. He becomes frank or furtive, reverent or ribald, impulsive or controlled, co-operative or selfish, largely as a result of what goes on around him, what happens to him day by day, when we are thinking least about his education. He gets some information too during this early period, but that is not always so certain because too often efforts are made to thwart his mind. He learns, for example, a great deal about his own external anatomy, but he may be given at the same time a wholly misleading vocabulary as to the parts of his body. And he may be barred from discovering the external anatomy of the opposite sex. It is here, long before the child can ask any questions regarding sex and reproduction, that he should acquire familiarity with the basic facts of external structure, and an accurate, if not technical vocabulary, since it is as easy to get the right names for the parts of the body as the family or baby terms; and second, the correct terminology leaves nothing to be unlearned or to cause confusion later.

Parents often make up their minds that they are not going to deceive their children as they had themselves been deceived, but then become confused and puzzled, waiting for the psychological moment to start something. Should we wait, before giving the child sex information, until he asks questions?

I attended a meeting of the mothers of fifth-grade children in one of our modern schools where they had some pets, and the teacher said to the mothers, "Our guinea pigs are going to have young. Are your children prepared to witness such a phenomenon?" Of the fifteen mothers, seven had given their ten-year-old children sex information, and the others had not. One of the women,

a physician, and the wife of a physician, said, "My daughter of ten is not the least bit interested. She has never asked me a question. In fact, my son of seventeen is not the least bit interested." I turned to her and said, "Did you wait until the child showed a consuming curiosity for the population of the United States, for the kind of products that they have in Texas, or Georgia before you taught them geography? Do you wait with other things until the child asks questions?"

We do not wait for the child to ask questions before we give him other information, and yet we are confident we are not forcing his mental efforts beyond human endurance. We find endless occasion to bring to his attention and to his thought random bits of knowledge about the world in which he lives—some of it valuable, some of it merely curious. We try always to keep within the child's comprehension and interest, or else we risk telling him what simply will not enter his mind at all. It is the same way with information regarding sex. It need not be forced; but neither must it wait in every case until the child is both curious and capable of formulating his queries. Indeed, information about sex and reproduction, like the attitudes we wish to establish with regard to ordinary relations between human beings, must come casually and informally through our incidental conversation and through the comments and observations we make day by day. The facts of birth and death come early enough into the environment; we need not go out of our way either to find a text for a sermon or to avoid a disagreeable topic. There are marriages and pregnancies and—occasionally still—nursing mothers. There is much a child can and should learn long before he can ask ques-

tions of the kind that embarrassed cultured ladies during the "Age of Innocence."

You will remember that some years ago leading educators succeeded in overcoming the opposition to the giving of any kind of sex information to children—or perhaps the inertia, rather than opposition. In an age of reason it seemed only fair to extend enlightenment to youth. And then what happened? We built up a beautiful ritual in the course of which the stork myth was killed quite dead. This took place in the gloaming, usually, or at least in a dimly lighted room. The child sat on our knees. The speaking parts were carried on in a whisper. A gentle sentimentalism suffused the atmosphere. And after a little cool perspiration and a few spasmodic contractions in the throat, the tongue was loosened from the palate and the child was told, in suitable poetical language, that the stork is not the instrument of Fate that he had been supposed to be. The child, according to the lectures we were given, should have had the reaction to cause it to put its arms around the mother's neck and say, "Mother, I love you more than ever now." I have never known this reaction actually to take place.

This enlightenment is, of course, better than encouraging or tolerating the stork myth, or even ignoring the matter altogether. But it is not necessary to make a solemn ceremonial out of it in order to impress the child with the seriousness of the subject. On the other hand, sex and reproduction are not normally topics of table conversation; and the child will soon enough discover that they are not subjects for promiscuous discussion in public. Whatever reticence may be desirable, as between the child and outsiders, can rest on precisely the same bases

as his reticence regarding other matters that concern only himself and family.

In recommending broad and accurate information presented largely in a matter-of-fact manner, we do not assume that the child in his early and latent period has any direct need for the knowledge. For many years he could get along in total ignorance (if that is attainable) of all matters regarding sex. The prime reason, however, for the parents giving this information lies in the fact that total ignorance is unattainable, considering the nature of the surrounding world and of the child himself. It is important that the earliest ideas and values shall be in every way reliable. The first impressions will be overcome with difficulty, if at all, so that it does matter who gives these impressions and what kind of impressions they are—whether they are to be wholesome or disgusting, whether they are to be associated with persons the child loves and respects, or with those of whom he can later think only with contempt and shame. For it is comforting to recognize that sound first impressions are just as stable as the unfavorable kind. I think that is something that parents ought to remember—that first impressions are the lasting ones. If favorable they are lasting, and if unfavorable they are equally lasting.

Another consideration that distinguishes the stork story from the Santa Claus fable, for example, is the fact that in the latter case the interest is a declining one, whereas in the matter of sex it is steadily growing. It is unfair to use the argument which I have often heard advanced that we do not tell children the truth about everything, that we tell them fairy tales, and why not tell them a fairy tale about birth and reproduction?

We know they like the stork story better than the other story, but you cannot compare the two things in their value for the child: one is a childish phase, whereas the interest in sex is an adult manifestation, and you cannot begin on the wrong basis. I do not think that any terrible harm comes to children who have been told the stork story, but it is unfortunate if in guiding the child in this important part of his life you have to begin by saying, "What I told you at such and such a time is not true." It is important that the knowledge elements be soundly established before the emotions are aroused. During adolescence, when the foremost consideration should be given to questions of standards and ideals, we should be able to take matters of fact for granted. The information is now needed as a basis for social and moral guidance. We should not need to introduce it now when every reference to the physical facts, or every attempt to rectify earlier misconceptions, must meet a highly sensitized self-consciousness.

The sexual impulses, like all the others, represent inner forces which are in themselves without moral quality, but which have capacity for great good as well as for great evil. Sooner or later the individual must become aware of this, but his understanding does not come from being told, as so much information. It must rest rather on a cumulative experience of guided action and feeling. Our essential object should be to help the child into habits of using his impulses—all of them—for worthy ends. Sex education is thus a continuous process of emotional adjustment in which explicit information plays an important but subordinate part.

CHAIRMAN MYRICK: "Sex Education in School—The Winnetka Plan," is the subject of the talk by Mr. Washburne, Superintendent of the Winnetka Schools.

SEX EDUCATION IN SCHOOL—THE WINNETKA PLAN

Carleton Washburne, Superintendent of Schools, Winnetka, Illinois

When Mrs. Gruenberg spoke of total ignorance of sex as being unattainable, she made a statement which is important and true, and which answers many of the questions as to whether we should have sex instruction.

The question is not whether we should have sex instruction. We are going to whether we want it or not. The question is, "Who shall give it?"

Shall sex instruction be given in the home or in the school or on the street? Any question as to whether it shall be given at all is a purely theoretical one, and does not deal with the realm of facts. I do not believe that anyone would purposely advocate sex education on the street, yet those who oppose sex education in the school are to all intents and purposes advocating the worst type of sex education.

The home, ideally, would be the place to give it, if we had mothers and fathers who from the beginning had the attitude toward sex that made it possible for them to speak of sex matters without self-consciousness, and with simplicity, and who had the knowledge to speak with scientific accuracy. As a matter of fact, however, it is clearly demonstrable that even in very select communities, even in communities which take schools, and children, and education very seriously indeed, over half of the children

reach adolescence without having had sex instruction from their homes, and that those children who have reached adolescence without sex instruction in their homes have, in the great majority of cases, received sex instruction of the wrong sort from their fellow pupils in the schools. This fact has been demonstrated every time, so far as I know, that anyone has attempted scientific investigation of the matter.

Our questions are: "Can the instruction be given in the schools adequately and satisfactorily? Are the schools taking away something which the home should have? Is there any harm in talking to children in groups in the school, instead of talking to them at home alone?"

Personally, I believe that so far as it is possible parents should give the sex instruction in the home right from the beginning. The first time a child asks a question about how babies come into the world, the child should have information. I believe that children should know about their own bodies, the bodies of their brothers and sisters, and should have frank, wholesome information from their parents; the trouble is, most parents themselves were not taught that way. The parents are, in many, many cases, self-conscious in talking to their children.

I knew of a man out in California, a very good friend of mine, who was arguing with me one day on this question. He said, "I have four boys. I have taught those boys the truth about sex from the beginning. And yet, just the other day I caught those little rascals out behind the barn talking about the calf that had just been born to the cow, and in whispers, as if they knew something naughty about it. I believe it is inherent in child nature to feel there is

something hidden or secret in sex. I don't believe you can get rid of it."

I said, "What is your own attitude toward sex?" He said, with a little embarrassment, "Well, I never think of the sex act without being ashamed."

Of course his children would reflect that point of view, however scientifically he had tried to give the facts to them. His subconscious attitude would stand out more clearly in the minds of these children than his conscious effort at scientific instruction.

In Winnetka about six and a half years ago we began to put sex education into the schools. We put it in as a part of a course in biology. The course was elective; children did not need to take it if their parents did not wish. Most children very soon wanted to take the course. The children whose parents refused to allow them to take the course began taking the children who were taking it off to one side and getting their information second-hand. The children in the course started by thinking that everything about sex was perfectly natural. When they found, however, that they had special knowledge that was kept secret from their fellows, the wholesomeness of their attitude was partly spoiled. After one year of making the course elective, we changed it to a required course. We felt the attitudes of the children not taking it were spoiling the attitudes of children taking it.

Occasionally parents object. When they do, we say, "Come to us. If after a frank talk with us in the schools, you will agree to give the child full instruction at home to see that his mind is clean and straight in regard to sex matters, we will exempt your child." I think that in the

six years we have had this instruction, we have had only about a dozen such requests.

The great majority of parents who are too self-conscious about sex to teach the children themselves, who, having the wrong attitude toward sex do not want it taught in the school, are a little ashamed to come in and talk it over with us, and tell us just why they do not want their child taught the truth.

When a home teaches children frankly about sex, should those children have the course in school? Personally, I believe it is a good thing.

I know that my own youngsters were taught to use the tooth brush at home, and until they went to school it was a struggle to get them to use it daily. When they got to school and the teachers began to emphasize the need of using the tooth brush, our children developed an ambition to use it. There is a certain authoritativeness that comes from a source outside the home.

You have heard about the boy who said, "Dad is Santa Claus, and the stork, too, and I am going to look into this Jesus Christ business." Children sometimes get to feeling a certain lack of confidence in the instruction they are getting at home, and they need it buttressed by the more impersonal instruction given in the school.

While I believe that sex instruction in the school is, in the present state of society, the only possible solution for the majority of children, I want to say very definitely that it is a dangerous thing unless you are dead sure that you have somebody who can do it competently. We happen in Winnetka to have been very fortunate in the people who have handled this instruction, in Mr. Beatty and the various women. We have had people who can think

about sex as a straightforward, natural, decent, scientific, and pure, and also beautiful thing. In any school where sex instruction is introduced, we must be sure that the teachers have the right attitude.

We must be sure that they are not going to conceal something, that they are going to tell everything that needs to be told, that they are not going to use innuendoes and implications and circumlocutions, but that each teacher will tell honestly and frankly, and in straight, clear, simple language, every bit of the truth in regard to human reproduction.

The moment that the teacher tries to hide the thing a little bit, the moment she does it all by analogy and talks about the plants and animals and says, "Now, in human beings it is much the same way," the moment she refuses to give clear-cut, definite information in words a child can understand, that moment the teacher is tempting that child to use his imagination, to have curiosity, to get further information from somebody else, to ask an older child for that information.

The one thing we do not want is to stimulate curiosity about sex. We want to satisfy it completely and definitely; we want to let the child feel that from his teacher he can get better information than from any other source.

The same thing is true, of course, of the education that should be given in the home.

In Winnetka, for practical reasons, we do not begin sex instruction until the seventh grade. Where children are in need of instruction earlier we try to handle it through following up the individual cases. If a child moves out to Winnetka from Chicago or some other place, and has a lot of wrong information, and comes into one of

our fourth or fifth grades, it is not long before we begin to find him a source of infection. We find the thing spreading out and we are very soon called in to try to stop it. We get hold of every child who has been infected, regardless of his age, and we give him a perfectly straight, frank talk. We get rid of his curiosity and explain to him just as honestly as we know how what the whole thing is about, and why we don't talk about it in public any more than we take baths in public.

I often use this analogy in talking to a little child, around second or third grade, especially if he is a boy: "Now you like to cuddle with your mother, to kiss her, to sit in her lap. Yet you wouldn't want to do it in front of the whole class of children. In the same way, you don't say your prayers in the street. You do it privately in your own home. It is perfectly right to kiss your mother; it is right to say your prayers. But these things are not done in public. In the same way, we don't talk in public about how babies come into the world. You can talk about it to your own mother and father, or to us, but not to other children. We want you to come to us. We will tell you everything you want to know. But do not talk about it with your playmates."

In some such way we expose the infection to sunlight and kill out the insidious germs that sometimes creep into the lower grades.

The problem of getting enough teachers of the right type has prevented our giving sex instruction lower than the seventh grade. Parents should begin the instruction as fully as they are able from the beginning. But even if you are sure your own child is getting the right instruction, you want to be sure the other children are not going to

contaminate your child, and you want, therefore, to see that every child gets the right attitude toward sex. At present it is only through the schools that we can make right sex instruction universal.

CHAIRMAN MYRICK: I think Mr. Beatty needs no introduction. He is the Assistant Superintendent of the Winnetka Schools, and he will speak on the "Method of Teaching."

METHOD OF TEACHING SEX

Willard W. Beatty, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Winnetka, Illinois

The first and most important idea that is essential for a teacher of sex instruction in the schools, or in the home, or anywhere else to have is to realize that sex is a perfectly normal function in life, and that there cannot be life without sex and that, therefore, there is nothing more strange or unusual or secret about sex than there is about eating or breathing or eliminating the waste products of the body.

Sex has to be thought about as a perfectly normal experience in the lives of all of us, and for that reason we believe that in starting such instruction in the schools, it is necessary first of all for our children to know just as much as they possibly can about life itself. We do not believe that we can teach sex unless we teach it as a phase of living; therefore, our course in sex instruction, or our course which includes sex instruction, is a course in biology.

We must frankly confess that we began teaching

biology primarily to get this matter of sex straight. There is no use dodging the question. That is why we did it, but we came to the conclusion pretty early in the game that what I have just said held true, and that we had to teach life first.

We started in by giving a course in sex instruction in twelve to eighteen meetings of a class; at the present time we are giving our biology course over a period of eighteen weeks, meeting five periods a week for thirty-five minutes, and the children ask for more time. It is one of the few courses in our schools where, as the course begins to draw toward its close, the children keep coming to the teacher and saying, "Can't we keep this up for a week or two, or three, or four weeks longer? There is so much more about ourselves that we wish to know," and I do not know but what before we get through we will be taking a year to our instruction. Not instruction in sex, but instruction in the whole idea of life and living things.

We begin our course with the simplest living organism. We begin with the amoeba and bacteria, and other single-celled organisms and we attempt away down there in the simpler, living things to build up certain general ideas. We attempt to build up ideas about the process of a living thing acquiring food; about living things depending on oxygen and carbon dioxide and other elements of the air in order that they have life; and about eliminating waste products and certain general ideas about the process of living things coming from other living things. Then we develop all of those ideas by illustrating their existence, first in the small unicellular animals with asexual reproduction and the very simplest processes of metabolism, on through the more complicated living forms in both the

plant and animal kingdom; and as we build up through the plant and animal kingdom we bear in mind certain ideas.

One such principle is that higher forms do not reproduce nearly as profusely as the lower forms do. That is, the higher the animal structure, the fewer the eggs which are laid—from the fly which lays a few million eggs in a season up to the bird which lays from two to a dozen for her nesting. This decrease in number is possible because of the increasing care which the mother provides for her young, both prior to birth and for the period immediately following.

Step by step we see this development: From simpler forms where large numbers of eggs are laid which are in turn fertilized outside of the body in many instances, so that chance may prevent fertilization entirely; through intermediate forms where a modified copulation takes place, as in the crayfish; to birds where the eggs are fertilized inside of the body, but are brought to maturity outside of the body; and lastly to where the eggs are fertilized inside of the body and complete their embryonic development inside of the mother. This general principle is stressed and illustrated repeatedly as we climb the ladder of increasingly more complex living forms. The idea that the number of young decreases in proportion as the liability to fertilization, development, and maternal care increases is pretty clearly understood by the children before we even approach a discussion of mammalia.

The reason I stress that now is because through experience we have discovered that certain things are true. One is that the greatest harm in this whole matter of sex instruction lies in the idea of sex coming as a shock to the

child, when he discovers suddenly that something is true which he did not believe was true previously.

A few years ago I had an instance that brought this very forcibly to my mind in one of the classes which I was instructing. We had been considering, I think, the chicken, and had talked about the actual method of fertilization of the hen's eggs, just what the rooster did, and how it was done, and so forth. The next day we began talking about mammals and one of the boys asked the question whether much the same thing took place. I said, "Yes, we will discuss it more in detail later, but there has to be an actual, internal fertilization." Whereupon, one of the boys in the back of the room said, "That is all right, but you can't tell me my father and mother ever did anything like that."

That is the type of thing for which the home is responsible. In other words there had been developed in that particular home the feeling that somehow or other any form of physical contact was more or less indecent and, therefore, when he began to think forward to a physical contact that was as intimate as the thing we were discussing, the thing seemed impossible at the time.

In that particular case we went to develop our general thesis with our illustrations and I was very pleased to notice that, as we completed the final discussion in the matter of human beings, the small boy was neither shocked nor surprised, nor still of the opinion that such things had not happened in his own home.

I will tell you in just a moment how we develop right attitude, and I think you will see that his final reaction was a perfectly natural one, but there we had an illustration of just exactly the thing Mr. Greenberg was speak-

ing about, in that the home had developed an entirely artificial attitude so that the truth could not help but come as a shock. The first thing we have to do in our biology classes is to overcome the attitude of mind which the silence, shame, false modesty, and wrong attitudes of the adult and child environment in which the child has been previously have put this whole question of sex.

We, therefore, take a considerable time to build up a feeling of absolute confidence between the child and the teacher. The child must believe three or four things about the teacher: first of all, that the teacher is frank, that the teacher is outspoken, that the teacher is honest, and that there is going to be no beating around the bush; that if he asks a question, his question is going to get a perfectly frank, honest, careful consideration upon the part of the teacher, and it is going to be answered with the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Children have been lied to about sex by their grown-ups and they know they have been lied to, and they come to the conclusion when they enter a class of this kind that the teacher is going to lie to them also, and the first thing we have to do is to convince them we are not. We must be honest with them at every turn, and we say constantly we will answer every question. We say, "We will answer every question that you ask as you go through the course. If you ask the question before you are ready for the explanation, we will make a record of that question and it will be taken up in due time," and we abide by that promise absolutely.

There is never a question which we refuse to answer. There are occasionally times when the question gets on matters of conduct where there are wide divergences of

opinion among the adult population, for instance, the matter of birth control, and in cases of that kind we feel we have two obligations under the present state of society: one is to explain what the words mean—that intercourse without conception is possible, but that anything further than that must be carried back to the home for explanation. They have to take it home and get the final explanation of that situation, which brings out one other feature in this whole matter.

We do not start any class in biology without having done two things. First of all, we have a general parent-teacher meeting the first part of the year in which I make perfectly clear and explicit in a statement what we are going to do. In addition to that I send a letter home to all the parents by mail in which, among other things that I stress in connection with our school work, I state what we are going to do, so that no parents can say we put anything over on them. They know what is being done, and in that letter and in that statement I request the parents to make every effort which they can to have the child bring home and talk over at home what has been going on in the class day by day, starting in with simpler forms of life and carrying on up to the final discussion of human reproduction.

Then I stress, and my teachers stress with the children day by day, "Talk this over at home. Go home and get other ideas on the subject. Get an exchange of viewpoints in the home. Bring it back into the class and give it to us," and increasingly as we are succeeding in educating our parents in Winnetka, they are co-operating with us.

The first year or two that we tried this we almost

gave some of the parents nervous prostration. They could not stand the strain; the children knew too much for them. But as the parents have come to discover that we mean what we say and are going to do the job, they are beginning to get a bracer beforehand in the form of a certain amount of information themselves. This year I think a majority of our parents have encouraged confidence between the children and themselves in the bringing home of this information, and there has been a much finer, much more intimate exchange of information, exchange of knowledge, and exchange of viewpoints between the parents and the children, which I think is a very vitally important thing to have happen.

In the actual matter of instruction, as Mr. Washburne said, we do not beat around the bush, and we answer every detail when we get to human reproduction that the child may want to know about—about the construction of his own body, about the construction of the organs of the other sex—and we go into specific detail with regard to the actual process of coition or sexual intercourse. We do not approach that bluntly without any preparation, but lay a foundation in idealism.

We find that regardless of what the home contact of a child may be, if the actual idea of sexual intercourse is to be received by the child in the attitude of mind which we wish it to be received in, there must be a preparation on the part of the child's mind for the facts as they are going to be presented. In order to give that presentation we have found that the best approach is by the parallelism of the personal contact, the caress, the kiss, the feeling of desire for contact with those whom we like or love,

and, conversely, the dislike for such personal contact upon the part of those whom we do not like, or do not care very much about.

Almost every child (I think I could say every child quite safely) has felt the need of going to his mother or father when he was in pain, when he had been hurt, when he wanted sympathy, understanding, and help, and has sought personal contact, the personal caress, the kiss on the bump to make it well, or something of that kind. From that we lead him through a recognition of personal contact as an expression of the feeling of love and deep regard between two people to see the sexual relations as a culmination of that regard. Also, practically every child has an aunt or uncle, or somebody, who has wanted to kiss him and by whom he did not want to be kissed. There has been that very natural antipathy to being slobbered over by somebody, and there you have the beginning of your antipathy which it is necessary to establish if you are going to get the idea across that sexual intercourse should be limited to that person whom we are prepared to choose as a wife or a husband.

You have to give the idea that it is through the most sincere, and deep, and fine expression of personal love between two individuals that sexual experience is possible, and at the same time that it is a thing which cannot be tolerated or conceived of by a clean-minded, high-idealed person, with one toward whom that feeling does not exist.

Now that, in a nutshell, as far as one can express it in fifteen minutes, is what we are trying to do, and are doing.

CHAIRMAN MYRICK: I wish now to introduce Dr. Rachelle Yarros, Director, Social Hygiene Council, of Chicago, who will speak on "Sex Education and Parents."

SEX EDUCATION AND PARENTS

Dr. Rachelle S. Yarros, Director, Social Hygiene Council, Chicago

In the short time that is allotted to me, I can only emphasize further the need of sex social hygiene education, especially among parents, and briefly touch on the important points that must be presented to them. In my experience, although it may seem strange to some of you, it is comparatively easy to give to children the elementary knowledge of sex and reproduction. Of course, the earlier one begins, the more naturally these facts are received and registered with other facts on the comparatively clean slate of the child's mind. The longer we withhold this knowledge, the more difficult it becomes to impart it. The child is bound to pick up information from an environment which is surcharged with sex. At home and in their other surroundings, half-truths flavored with all kinds of notions, some vulgar and obscene, impress themselves upon the fertile mind of the child. Then, during the adolescent period with its conscious awakening of sex, bewilderment increases, adding fears, doubts, and confusion, thus complicating our problem. Even then, however, it is not as difficult as we are led to believe to give children the necessary sex information, because at this time there is a specially keen desire for knowledge concerning the body and its functions, and there is still great trust in the superior knowledge of the older generation. Moreover, because of the vivid imagination of adolescents, we should be able

to guide them toward clearer thinking and finer attitudes.

The situation is entirely different when we try to educate parents. By the time people have reached that stage, they have already accumulated all kinds of false notions and traditions and their attitudes toward sex problems have become quite fixed.

The father, for example, has learned about sex from all sorts of sources, mostly undesirable ones. His sex knowledge is tinged for the most part with obscenity and vulgarity. In his struggle with sex appetite and its satisfaction, he has frequently made compromises which he later tries to rationalize. And when love, courtship, marriage and family life bring him the higher sex satisfactions, he still remains exceedingly tolerant of the sex compromises of his youth. In fact, in most cases he remains firmly convinced that compromises are essential in the sex life of man.

As for the mother of the family, it is much more difficult to know what sex attitudes she brings because of her traditional upbringing, with its fear of sex and complete suppression of sex knowledge on the one hand, and on the other, because her whole life as a girl was directed and centered on using her sex with the ultimate object of acquiring a husband and family.

Sex education for parents, therefore, is a much more comprehensive task. To correct their distorted notions and to arouse their sincere interest in what they can do for the children, one must cover most of the phases of what we call social hygiene as well as of sex education proper. It is essential for them to know the dangerous prevalence of venereal diseases and how these diseases affect the individual, the home, and the child. They must realize the

importance of early diagnosis and effective treatment of venereal diseases. Such knowledge is particularly important because of the danger of transmitting such diseases to offspring, thus starting them with severe handicaps in the struggle for life.

It is essential for parents to know that silence and ignorance on the subject of sex is believed to be the underlying cause for the prevalence of prostitution, that prostitution is the largest contributing cause of venereal disease. Although prostitution is an ancient evil which perplexed the wisest minds of the past, yet in the last twenty-five years medical, psychological, and social facts have been brought to light which have produced profound changes in scientific and enlightened opinion in respect to the problem. In fact, the consensus of opinion in this country and in Europe is now that commercialized vice can and must be eradicated, and that segregation and examination only serve to give false security in sanctioning prostitution.

We must also present to parents the problem of sex delinquency with its underlying causes, economic, educational, psychological, social, and mental. All the medical and social protective measures designed to clear up environmental conditions must be discussed with parents because no amount of education of children would be of any value in an environment of disease and social menace.

As to sex education, it is necessary to distinguish between knowledge of sex and reproduction, and the inculcation of higher sex ideals. Since the preschool age is admitted to be of great importance for starting the development of the child in the right direction, we must not fail to impress parents with the necessity of conveying simple

scientific facts of reproduction to the child at that period, without fear of awakening prematurely the sex instinct. It is essential for the child to know that all living beings reproduce and that father and mother give part of themselves to make up the new life of the baby. The attention of the child should be deliberately called to the fact that all living things come either from seeds or eggs, and the processes of reproduction in flowers and in domestic animals should be explained. Children must learn that there is a differentiation in sex. They should learn to know early the bodily differences between boys and girls. A distinct effort should be made by parents to make the children understand these differences, for otherwise, an excessive and morbid curiosity is bound to develop. Again, we must make the greatest effort to teach parents how to convey to children in a simple but direct manner the process of mating and birth in the human species. First, because both among boys and girls, one finds a tremendous curiosity on the subject, out of all due proportion. In the second place, parents seem to experience the greatest difficulty in plainly stating these facts to their children. Indeed, they are almost paralyzed by fear when it is suggested that this must be done. We must make every effort to rid them of this unwarranted fear.

With the right kind of early preparation, it becomes much easier for parents to guide the child's knowledge during the adolescent period when it becomes necessary to discuss very frankly the physiological as well as the psychological changes that are about to take place at puberty. The girl must learn more about her reproductive organs, about ovulation and about menstruation. The boy must learn about the testicles and the testicular secretions

and what these physiological changes signify. They must come to see clearly that, although from a biological or animal viewpoint maturing means readiness to mate and reproduce, yet the human being has evolved so far from the animal that these manifestations are only indications that the boy is beginning to change into a man and the girl into a woman, and that for their complete development they need ten more years with every opportunity for physical, mental, and emotional growth.

We now come to the more difficult phase of sex education, and that is the inculcation of higher ideals and sex standards. This belongs to the realm of character-training, which does not depend so much on knowledge as on environment and the attitudes of those who surround the child from the time it is born. Here, again, we have great difficulty largely because our own attitudes and behavior in sex and related matters are in a state of extreme confusion. We must, however, in every way possible, through our own behavior, through literature and environment convey to the growing child that the important instinctive impulses should not be feared or suppressed but modified in accordance with the requirements of the highest happiness to the individual that is consistent with social good. The question of proper sublimation of the sex energy during adolescence is very important and such sublimation depends a great deal on the tastes in art, literature, and the humanities that we develop in the child and on the possibilities afforded for satisfying these tastes. Behavior in sex, like other behavior, depends largely on the ideals and standards that we have developed and on the control that we have over our appetites. We must keep completely absorbed in healthy and useful work receiving satisfaction from the things we do, while planning and

dreaming of the future. Character-building and idealism require much thought and care from the parents, the school, and the community. Are they willing and really anxious to do their part? With a finer relationship between the parents, the home should survive not only because of the part it plays in the protection of children, as in the past, but because of the progressive changes it is undergoing—greater freedom, better opportunities for the development of the children, understanding, sympathy, and higher idealism in the place of mere parental authority.

Mr. Beatty: I have been asked one question which I think may be of interest to all of you.

Whether or not we segregate the boys and girls in Winnetka in giving this instruction. The answer is, yes, we do. I can also add to this the statement that I, personally, do not think it is necessary to do so, but many parents believe that it is the necessary thing to do. We have a means of doing it very inconspicuously so that the children are not conscious of being separated because of sex. I think it would be exceedingly harmful if the children realized that they were being separated for this particular instruction.

They are not separated for this instruction, they are separated for something else where they consciously realize that the separation is desirable. We take those who do not go to the playground, where we have organized games of a type for the girls the boys would not play, and a type for the boys the girls could not play.

Voice: Isn't the seventh grade rather late?

Mr. Beatty: I would say put it down into the fourth or fifth, if we had the means of doing it.

PROBLEMS OF THE ADOLESCENT—CAN THE PARENT UNDERSTAND?

THE IMPERATIVE AIMS IN ADOLESCENT TRAINING

William H. Burnham, Professor of Education and Social Hygiene, Clark University

In the development of the human individual there comes a time "when the golden gates of childhood are forever passed" and the youth enters on the new life of adolescence. This is a focal point in education, because it is a focal point in development.

The characteristics of this period have been made familiar by many writers since the classic work on adolescence by G. Stanley Hall. We have at this period a great influx of energy appearing in both physical and mental phenomena: a spurt of growth at the beginning, development of the heart and other organs, readjustment of the endocrine functions, reinforcement of the body against chronic disease; on the mental side new interests, new ambitions, new zest to meet life with its stern realities, and a new birth in relation to society.

Again we have the appearance of hereditary forces. Injurious tendencies and an unfortunate heredity are likely to manifest themselves; while on the other hand, good stock and healthful strains appear as a background and defense of the individual in the adverse conditions of a threatening environment.

It is a period also of relative instability; old forms of reaction, old habits, are disturbed or broken up, new forms of behavior developed. All kinds of aberrations and perversities may appear. Susceptibility to acute disease

seems increased; many disorders incident to development occur, but are likely to be outgrown with proper environment.

Again adolescence is the period of mental and moral variation and development. The reformers in the church, in the state, in education and industry, are young men and young women. Then for a time the individual shakes off the fetters of convention and inertia; the possibility of discoveries and new activities for a time exists. It is surprising how largely the world's progress has been due to adolescent ideals and performance. In human life and society the youth movement is the oldest movement in the world. To give opportunity for adolescent initiative is the greatest accomplishment of intelligent education.

The problem then is to adapt education at this period to an individual with such characteristics. These great impulses and tendencies, with all they involve, should be considered in determining the training of youth. A few aims are vitally imperative. Like everything else of superior importance, in outline they are simple, although in practical accomplishment infinitely complex and difficult. The following are some of them.

SELF-DISCOVERY

The first imperative aim of adolescent education is the opportunity for self-discovery, and to this end an introduction to many different activities and to many different interests. Sooner or later the more intelligent adolescent begins to philosophize. He meets the great problems that have confronted youth in all ages from Gautama and Socrates to the present. He reflects on the causes and possibilities of existence, is convinced perhaps by the argu-

ments of the sophist Gorgias that nothing exists, that if it did exist we could not know it, that if we did know it, we could not tell it to anyone else; nevertheless he finds himself unable to escape the stupendous fact of his own personal existence. Before this fact he stands amazed, at once humbled and exalted; he studies science, and finds that on the basis of chance it would be perhaps one in many billion that he himself as an individual personality should be living here and now; and it may be that he feels in himself the opportunity and privilege of all the ages. How could it be otherwise than that he should wish to learn about himself, his own abilities, his potentialities, his powers, his connection with the world about him, his relation to his companions, his possible function and work.

Whether inclined to philosophy or to action, the youth desires to find out the facts about himself. No wonder the Greeks emphasized self-knowledge as the acme of wisdom and made *gnothi se auton* the fundamental maxim of their mental hygiene. To do anything else as soon as youth begin to study this problem, any attempt to evade it, to camouflage it, to postpone it, would be at the outset a blow against the integrity of the personality, a suggestion to the youth to dodge reality, to be dishonest with one's own self from the outset. Whether or not we give opportunity for self-discovery, youth will make it; but they may fail to discover their own higher powers, their special capacities.

INTEGRATION OF THE PERSONALITY

Among their discoveries is likely to be the amazing fact of one's own integrated personality. This suggests the second imperative aim of adolescent training. The aim

should be to preserve at all cost the integrity of the adolescent's personality and to develop this healthfully at higher and higher levels. The psychology of integration is simple, but difficult to apply. As Sherrington, the great neurologist, and Mme Montessori alike have pointed out, the acme of integration is found in the mental process of concentrated attention. As Royce long ago pointed out, from the genetic point of view attention is a reaction of the whole organism comparable to the tropisms in plants and animals. In children, while doing their own tasks, Montessori has noted the way a kind of polarization of attention occurs, which has a steadying, calming, integrating effect. It is the same in the adolescent. Concentrated attention is temporary integration; much training in this is needed by the adolescent. This is the true safeguard of the personality, this the kind of defense needed.

But this leaves the matter all in the air. How shall we bring about this training of attention? If the adolescent is given a fairly rich environment and a reasonable amount of freedom, he is apt to make another marvelous discovery sooner or later, namely, that he can do something really worth while. Each of you perhaps can remember when you first made this discovery, that you could do some one thing really well, and how it acted as a stimulus and an inspiration to you thereafter. This insight into one's own capacity is likely to become more than an incentive, often a driving force and to transform the character of the individual.

A WORTH-WHILE TASK

This leads us to the third imperative aim, a significant task. Since the great means of integrating an indi-

vidual's personality is the doing of a worth-while task, every adolescent, like every genius, should sooner or later have some great all-absorbing task which will unify the many otherwise discordant new interests and activities of the youth. A worth-while task of one's own choosing every adolescent desires. It is youth's legitimate right.

The adolescent usually discovers not only that he has some special ability and can really do something himself as a significant part of the world's work, but also he discovers that he is weak or defective in certain directions, that in certain things he is apt to fail, and that in many things he cannot do as well as others. From this experience of failure may come a wholesome humility and modesty and the stimulus to more careful and more industrious effort. Frequently, however, such failures of the individual develop a sense of inferiority which inhibits further endeavor.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENT

Thus the fourth imperative aim is significant accomplishment. For this end the stimulus of success is necessary. Successful accomplishment gives a stimulus that few can do without. Think, for example, of your own experience. From definite success in something, you have developed the habit of success. On the other hand continued failure, as many know from personal experience, not only depresses, tends to develop a sense of inferiority, and paralyzes endeavor, but the habit may develop, and this again may transfer to other forms of activity, until in everything the individual seems handicapped and doomed to failure.

Right here in this experience of success or failure, the

individual learns the truth about himself and should learn to face reality in regard to his own powers and his own achievements. One who does this will find the possibility always of worth-while activity, although the achievement of certain ends may be beyond the individual's powers. But those who faithfully perform their tasks, even if doomed to be heroes of defeat, will find the fight worth making for itself, whether victory or failure be the result. But usually the aim of teachers should be to give the stimulus of success; and it is, we may say, the duty of every teacher at some time, in some way, in some subject, to give every adolescent the stimulating experience of a significant success.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL INTERESTS

The fifth aim is the development of social interests. Since, as Rousseau long ago pointed out, at adolescence the individual has a new birth in relation to society, it becomes desirable to develop right social attitudes, and interests in great social movements, such as the interest in organized philanthropy, positive effort for hygiene, public welfare, and the like. This affords opportunity for manifold significant tasks, and there is likely to be no lack of activity in such movements, provided permanent interests are developed.

SOCIAL SUCCESS

Finally is the imperative aim of social success. The individual adolescent desires to do something really significant in the social groups of which he is a member. If he acquires the ability to render a significant service, that gives a reward to which no other is comparable. Every

youth desires such opportunity, and nothing is more tragic, nothing perhaps more menacing to the mental health than lack of opportunity and lack of ability to achieve social success.

Every boy and girl should be trained to such superiority in something that each will be able to render a distinct service in some social group and thus to receive the stimulus that comes from success. This development of superiority in each child is the aim of democratic education, the ideal in its higher form so far as the individual is concerned—a stupendous vagary, some will say, but precisely such was the lower form of this ideal when it demanded that every boy and girl should have the opportunity to learn to read and write. Thus our final aim involves actual social training in real democratic groups, an aim that should be made universal in American schools, involving a form of training absolutely essential for the permanent development of democracy.

The great objective of the democratic ideal is actual training in real democratic groups, where each child, in Pasteur's phrase, has the opportunity for individual initiative for the common welfare, where the leader does not dominate the group, but the different superiorities of the members of the group are integrated for a common purpose by the leader.

The aristocratic ideal tells us that education should be controlled by the superior wisdom of the social group. To this we all agree. More concretely, it tells us that the superior men of the state should control education. This is a more difficult proposition. Who is the superior man? Ludovici or his Alpine guide? It is hard to find him. Of course, you may explain and make the necessary modifi-

cations, but as soon as you hedge and begin to do this, what becomes of your all-around superior man?

Teachers, we may naturally expect from their daily acquaintance with pupils, may be able to pick out the superior; but teachers, Terman tells us, do not know the superior children when they see them. Parents perhaps do better, for they are apt to look upon their own children as superior; and Spearman tells us every child is a genius in embryo; and the great teachers have been wont to take this position. To find the superior man, however, is difficult; and yet the superior wisdom of the group may be found in the integrated superiorities of all the different members.

Perhaps we shall find that the management of a social group by the integrated superiority of all the members of the group is the only means of realizing Emerson's ideal of direction of the group by the superior intelligence of "masters instructed in all the great arts of life." Such management is possible, and represents the natural reconciliation of the age-long conflict between aristocracy and democracy. It represents at once a democratic aristocracy and an aristocratic democracy.

Such are some of the overlapping aims of adolescent training. Let me repeat, and then we may consider them in relation to practice.

(1) Self-discovery, and for that end an introduction to many activities. (2) Integration of the personality, and to that end training of attention. (3) The doing of a worth-while task, and for that end a maximum of freedom. (4) Significant accomplishment, and for that end the habit of success. (5) The development of the wider social virtues, and for that end the development of interest in

various forms of social welfare. (6) Social success, and for that end the development of such superiority in something that one may render a distinct social service.

These are very simple things, very obvious, very familiar perhaps to most of you, in large part an old story. All of us perhaps will agree to them. Clearly then the thing to do is to regard them in practice. What do we actually do?

We say the aim of adolescent training should be self-discovery, but we insist on training in a few conventional things of a narrow curriculum with little opportunity for self-discovery. We demand training in concentrated attention, in the doing of a significant task freely chosen, then we permit many forms of distraction and disintegration, and impose our own tasks instead of granting that freedom of choice which makes one feel responsible for it as really one's own.

We recognize the need of the stimulus of success, and yet we have provided a dozen conditions and methods in the schools that prevent marked success for from 25 to 50 per cent of the pupils. We see the importance of social as well as individual success and the need of social training in really democratic groups, and we proceed to dominate the group by our own ideas and methods, or perhaps choose student leaders, courteous and benevolent leaders, but who nevertheless dominate the group and often rob the individual members of the opportunity for initiative and real group activity.

Again in the inevitable conflicts between the new and the old, between ancient good and the newer and higher good, between old doctrines and new truth, more concretely perhaps between the traditions and beliefs of our

fathers and the demonstrated truths of science today, in these sometimes heartbreaking conflicts, we recognize the need of solving the problem, not by repression of one side and the dominance of the other, but by integration at a higher level, and yet we proceed with the same old dogmatism, and arouse the same inevitable conflict between the eternal youth movement and the fossilized dogmas and prejudices of an obsolete past.

We all accept as the merest axiom and platitude that it is only by self-activity, the youth's own doing and thinking, that training comes; and yet in the schools and in the homes by a score of subtle methods we proceed to rob the youth of their own legitimate tasks.

Two things at least should be obvious. First of all, the adolescent period of education is not a time for standardization. Whatever may be said for the standardized work advocated by H. G. Wells in the elementary schools, it is quite out of place in the secondary and higher schools. Now, if ever, is the time when opportunity should be given boys and girls for thinking their own thoughts and doing their own tasks. Mr. Wells, in his own character, furnishes, I think, all the illustration we need. Wells apparently is himself an example of permanent adolescence, an example of youth not only with many of its defects, but with a permanent vitality and youthfulness.

As expressed by a recent critic, Mr. Church, the mainspring of Wells' being is an enormous emotional energy. Displeasing, even disgusting to some, but with an enormous fruitfulness characterized, however, by a sort of adolescent shamelessness that saps all the insular and starchy dignity out of his character making him springy and volatile, a sort of Olympian.

Wells, like a typical adolescent, first acts and then thinks. His writing is suffused by a vital spirit, ever changing, ever new, ever creative. For such a character a standardized education is obviously out of the question.

Second, we should aim at least to understand our adolescent boys and girls. When the adolescent discovers the self, naturally he becomes very sensitive in regard to it and devises perhaps many defense mechanisms to protect it from anything that remotely threatens its integrity. If perchance on account of failure of adverse conditions, a sense of inferiority is developed, then the youth is apt to resort to some means of compensation to atone for deficiency and defect. But whatever the condition, the youth, boy or girl, is likely to become extremely sensitive, subject to strong emotion, but especially anxious to be understood.

The adolescent period has been frequently referred to as the nascent period for emotion. This is true, but it is also a period of great reserve. The youth has ideals, aspirations, and feelings that are too sacred to be discussed. This may be especially in regard to one's aspirations in life—such matters as choice of a calling, the choice of a political party, the love affairs of the adolescent, and, most of all perhaps, in matters of religion. Adults sometimes outrage this reserve in regard to the most sacred things.

Thus one of the important hygienic needs in connection with these aims is a sympathetic understanding. This can hardly be put too strongly; but to give this sympathetic understanding, one needs not merely sympathy and good will but also a knowledge of adolescent development, that interest in adolescence that means prevision for the

developments, normal and abnormal, likely to come. Goddard has suggested the vast number of conduct disorders and crimes that would be prevented by means of right understanding.

Our courts are picking up many thousands of delinquent boys and girls every year. A very small percentage of them ever are restored so as to contribute their share to the general welfare. The most of them are always a burden and many of them become our most dangerous criminals.

Why is this so?

Because we have made no effort to understand the children.

To the insistent question "What shall be done for the individual adolescents who face such glorious opportunities, are threatened by such serious dangers?" the answer in detail for concrete cases is vastly complex and puzzling, but the general answer for all cases is simple. What is needed is the help of the well-established teachings of mental hygiene and training in habits of mental health.

We may sum up the whole matter of the aims and problems of mental hygiene and education at adolescence in perhaps a dozen keywords. Some of these are the following: freedom, opportunity, self-discovery, self-assertion, self-expression, self-realization, a significant task, individual and social success, integration of the personality, removal of mental conflicts, not by repression of one but by higher integration of the conflicting ideals, and the democratic ideal in its higher form.

And as a most important practical aim throughout, sympathetic understanding. Spranger is right. The adolescent yearns to be understood. The business of education is to understand.

CONFRONTING THE WORLD—THE ADJUSTMENTS OF LATER ADOLESCENCE[1]

Dr. Frankwood E. Williams, Medical Director, National Committee for Mental Hygiene

I have two points that I wish to make. I hesitate to discuss them, however, because each would seem to me so obvious that I feel I run the risk of being boresome. However, though they would seem to be obvious, like most obvious things, they have been overlooked almost entirely in our thinking and discussion of the subject; and because they have been so lost sight of, secondary problems have arisen to occupy our attention. These have aroused considerable heated discussion as there are many differences of opinion about some of them, and I risk being seriously misunderstood through having the obvious points I wish to make caught up and lost in the emotions aroused by secondary issues. However, the topic is quite too important for one to hesitate for either of these reasons to discuss it frankly.

It seems to me that the adolescent, getting ready to face the world, has two major problems before him. We give him innumerable problems, from learning how to dress neatly and speak correctly to passing the college-entrance examinations. We place great emphasis upon all of these and a host of other problems. However, if we will strip away what is artificial and what is important merely

[1] Copyright, 1926, by the *New Republic, Inc.;* reprinted with permission.

because we make it important—and the importance of things is, after all, relative—we get to two issues which face every adolescent boy and girl and upon the solution of which depends entirely the success of their future lives.

These two problems are, first, emancipation from the home, and, second, the establishment of heterosexuality. Everything in the future depends upon the success of the boy or girl in solving these two problems.

In spite of the absolute, fundamental, and primary importance of these two things, the home, the school, and our social life generally seem to be almost entirely organized and banded together to defeat, in so far as they can, the establishment of these two things.

In this adolescent boy who until recently has been, on the whole, a dutiful, gentle, lovely child, parents note with fear and anxiety changes that are taking place. There are his increasing gruffness; his lack of consideration for others, particularly those of whom he has been especially considerate before, his mother for instance; the roughening of his language through the bringing in of slang and sometimes terms that are even more disliked than slang; his increasing intolerance of other children, particularly the younger children in the family; his increasing secretiveness. He is not so open-hearted as he was before; he does not confide as he did before; he keeps more to himself, and one is not sure of what is going on in his mind. This makes the mother very anxious.

He is less given to demonstrations of affection; he is inclined to resist advice and to scoff at sentiment; he shows a tendency toward bizarre methods of dressing, either in the way of wearing old, disgraceful clothing, or at other times of being decidedly over-particular and dandified in

his dressing; he demands more and more money; he is increasingly reckless and rude.

These are things that parents note, as their children enter adolescence, and become much alarmed. But in reality the general tendency indicated by all of these things is healthy, although the particular forms or aspects it may take may not necessarily be healthy and certainly are sometimes unwise; the *tendency,* which is the beginning effort on the part of the child to emancipate himself from home, is healthy.

If this tendency does not manifest itself, then indeed parents should become concerned. At the present time, however, if the child goes docilely through his adolescence, still childishly dependent upon his mother, if he is obedient and never gives a moment's trouble or care, if he has his arm simply covered with insignia of approval for good deeds, then the parents are happy and pleased. Then, frequently, they might better be thoroughly alarmed—clear to the end of their toes.

As it is, if the boy does begin to show some of these emancipating tendencies, the parents become anxious. As I have noted, any of these reactions may cease to be healthy in itself, may be developed to a degree where it no longer represents a healthy reaction, but an unhealthy overcompensation; but if so, this undesirable overcompensation is due not to moral depravity or "original sin," but to the resistance to the original healthy tendency that has been met with by the child. These three things should be kept clearly in mind—the underlying tendency, which is sound and healthy; the manifestations of this tendency, which bear the same relationship to the tendency as do symptoms to a disease, which may be annoying and dis-

tressing, but which never have the same relative importance as the thing itself; and finally, the secondary reactions which may be even more annoying and distressing and even dangerous, but which are produced by ignoring the real situation and attempting to deal with the symptoms of the situation.

If to the first feeble efforts of the child to emancipate himself, resistance is raised, a child who is healthy mentally and physically will make yet another and a more vigorous attempt to accomplish his objective. His own resistance will increase as the resistance he has to meet increases. Misunderstanding and anger—and heart-ache—enter. If the resistance mount to the point where the contest becomes vulgarized into a pushing and shoving contest, there is likely to be produced, because of the misunderstanding of the real significance of what is taking place and the consequent unwise resistance on the part of parents, a whole host of secondary reactions which are necessary for the child under the circumstances, but which are probably not nearly so healthy as were the first. The whole issue becomes confused. The parents are fearful and anxious. They had hoped to raise a gentleman and a scholar and they have a roughneck. The boy is angry and rebellious, also puzzled and hurt. Confusion is worse confounded, frequently at this point, by a further unwise action on the part of parents. With a lack of logic unworthy of a school child—and the point is not missed by the adolescent boy or girl—they demand love in payment for sacrifices that have grown out of responsibilities they themselves assumed voluntarily and for their own pleasure, and they demand respect as though that were a right that came with accidental parenthood. There is something

ludicrous and pathetic in an angry woman, whether wife or mother, demanding love, and something pathetic and comic in a childishly angry man, who has lost mastery of himself and of a situation, demanding respect. These things are not had by right.

Parents need not be fearful of losing the love of their children. If they would only understand that the love which the children have for them is quite a fundamental thing; that it is almost impossible to eradicate, even if one wished to do so; that there is no desire on the part of the child, in spite of his symptoms, to deny this love or to get away from it completely, they would be less anxious and their emotions would less frequently plunge them into mistakes at critical moments. But they don't seem to know this. They take these symptomatic manifestations as real and are fearful. They can drive away the love the child has for them or they can change it into something quite different and harmful—but they cannot lose it.

Children do love their parents, often even when their parents are cruel and unworthy, and when any understanding at all or intelligence has been shown they respect them. But neither this love nor this respect should be kept on a childhood plane. Although he may not know it, it is against these bonds that the adolescent is struggling. It is a vital matter for him and if it becomes necessary he is quite right in putting up a vigorous resistance. Freeing himself from bonds which can only be a handicap in the period of his life he is now entering does not imply any real lack of respect for father or of genuine affection for mother. It is merely that these emotions must now be brought to function at an adult level. The child must come into control of his own emotional forces.

This process is as necessary as learning to walk and difficulties and dangers are involved. We do not, however, prevent the child from learning to walk for fear it will fall in the fire or down the stairs. First shielding it from the fire and the stairs, we encourage, urge, and guide it. At first it may look as if learning to walk as an adolescent involved greater danger than learning to walk as an infant. Learning to walk involves the possibility of death or of serious permanent crippling. This is not so true in adolescence though it may appear even more so. These possibilities are at times involved, but if parents will examine closely those activities on the part of adolescents which give them such great concern, they will find, I think, that seldom is either of these dangers involved. At most what is involved—and it is this that is the real cause of the concern, although the parents may not be aware of it —is the possible embarrassment and "disgrace" to themselves growing out of these activities rather than any very great likelihood of serious danger to the child. At least this is clear—whatever the danger, whether to parent or child, the danger in the opposite direction, so far as the child is concerned, is surer and greater.

If this emancipation is resisted unwisely consequences follow. Either the child gives up in his attempt—and if so he is lost—or, failing in complete accomplishment, he meets the issue by an unhealthy overcompensation and cripples himself seriously—or he succeeds.

If the child is successful, his self-respect and confidence are increased and, once the freedom is gained, whatever has been fundamental in the bond of affection remains and is healthful and helpful and upon a stable and abiding basis. It may no longer be expressed in the old

ways, as it should not be, but it does find healthful and worth-while ways of expressing itself.

Discipline can come only from leadership. Surely in all other affairs, aside from parental matters, we are seeing this. We no longer believe merely because somebody puts himself over us or, by some fortuitous circumstances is put over us, that we need to abide by his discipline. We follow, as adults in the community, those individuals who inspire our confidence and our desire to follow them by their worthiness of leadership. That is really the only kind of discipline that counts, whether it is in a business organization or a military organization or any other kind of an organization. You can make people goosestep and march if you wish to use a discipline of force. You can gain your objective temporarily, but it is only a temporary objective you have gained. You have not changed anything fundamental at all. You have no real discipline, no real control. It can be beyond you in a minute. You may compel a boy to say "Yes, sir," and snap his heels together, in the home. It may look pretty but it does not imply that he respects you or that he carries any "Yes, sir," spirit into his activities outside the home. Real discipline in the home comes because the parents are capable of leading and are looked to naturally for this leadership. Out of this leadership grows discipline.

What is needed, it seems to me, is a changed attitude on the part of parents through an understanding of what it is that the child is attempting to do and an ability to differentiate between what is merely symptomatic and what is real and of vital importance to the end that parents may co-operate in the vital things instead of resisting them.

Confidence is needed. Not confidence in the child's

wisdom or in his ability to cope unaided with the complex problems that are facing him, the decisions he has to make, but confidence and belief in the rightness of the thing that he is attempting to do.

The matters of detail and incident can then be handled. There will be differences of opinion between the child and the parents over the details, but these can be satisfactorily dealt with in spite of occasional electrical storms if there is confidence between these two and understanding at least on the part of the parents.

An adolescent boy is keen for advice. He goes to all sorts of places for it—except to his parents. He is as puzzled as he can be. His cocksureness has no reality in it. He is a very much puzzled, confused boy. He wants advice. He is dead against any advice that is obviously based upon a profound misunderstanding of the situation and that is either lachrymose or threatening. He knows that tears and threats are but a sign of weakness. They are not a sign of wisdom or of understanding. They affect him not at all.

He is particularly resentful, and rightfully so, of any appeal for good conduct on the ground of love of his mother. That is a very vital thing with him. It is a thing that is troubling him right now. It is a thing the enervating of which he is, in a healthy way, trying to get away from, and to appeal to the weakest thing in him, the thing that he is trying to manage and get under control, he realizes is wholly unfair; while you may force him to capitulate temporarily, even permanently, you do him an incalculable injury. Love of mother is an instrument of terrible potentiality. Because by its use we can so easily cow individuals into a semblance of proper conduct, we use it

recklessly. We go farther and extol the man who shows great devotion to his mother and to the man who can weep at the name of "mother" we ascribe special virtue. The love of mother is too valuable an asset in the life of any man to run the risk of turning it into a liability through reckless use.

A man who is "so good" to his mother is not always so good to his wife or so successful in his relationships with others; and a man's life is more concerned with his wife and with others than with his mother. A wise mother should realize this and not demand too much. She should find her happiness, even though it be a bit wistful, in helping her boy to launch his life from her own and in seeing him strong and able because of her.

So when there is nothing but misunderstanding, profound misunderstanding—which he cannot explain, but of which he is very well aware—and a lachrymose attitude, and threatening and appeals to his weakness when he is striking out for strength, the boy resists, as he should. He is said to be obstinate and resentful of advice—but he goes elsewhere hungry for advice.

If a boy smashes a car or breaks his collar-bone in recklessness or comes home with alcohol on his breath, these are not necessarily signs of moral depravity. They are not, to be sure, desirable things in themselves, but they are an expression, even though a very awkward and undesirable expression, of a tendency that is healthy rather than unhealthy.

Fainting and weeping mothers or storming fathers do not contribute anything at this time, except further to complicate the situation and produce a whole round of secondary reactions which may be worse than the first and

not nearly so healthy. The boy really didn't wish to smash the car. He had no desire to break his neck. He probably didn't wish to get drunk. However, he was wishing something and he was trying to find some sort of an expression for it. Here parents can be of help. Even though the boy may not know what he is trying to do, they should know and with their greater ingenuity and experience enable the boy to find a more satisfactory expression.

The important thing is not the particular detail, but the tendency. We lose track of the woods because of the trees. So absolutely fundamental and vital is this emancipation that it were far better that we have smashed cars and broken bones and even alcohol on breaths—particularly in view of the adolescent circumstances under which these adolescents have alcohol upon their breaths—than that this boy should fail in the objective toward which he is directed.

The extent to which these expressions, unwise, awkward, damaging sometimes, will go, will be in proportion to the resistance that the boy meets at home—that is, if he is mentally and physically healthy. The objective will be safely attained in proportion to the co-operation that the boy obtains from the parents. This is a difficult time. Sometimes secondary reactions are so confusing that it is hard to keep in mind the real issue, but after all if the parents are in command of their own emotional forces, they will not overlook the woods for the trees and, instead of being so fearful and so anxious, they will be thankful that their adolescent is beginning to manifest evidences of a healthy adulthood and express their energies in assisting him to his goal.

They will rightfully be a bit concerned as to just what course events are going to take during this period of learning to walk, but they will not doubt either the process or its necessity. They will have confidence in its rightfulness and in its probable eventual success. They will sit not in anxiety and fear but—a bit upon the sidelines, not too much in evidence, but yet there all the time—they will sit observing what is going on, encouraging what is going on, and guiding what is going on.

If they find no tendency on the part of their boy or girl to make this emancipation, they will then become anxious and they will begin to take steps gently to shove this backward duckling from the nest.

Emancipation from the home does not mean leaving home, renouncing it as if it were something unworthy and no longer of need, freeing one's self from all the relationships and co-relationships and community feeling that should exist in an intimate group and which can be so valuable, helpful, and stabilizing. (One must say *should* and *can* here although one would like to say *do* and *are*.) In some instances it may mean just this, but it should mean no more than the psychological freeing of one's self from childish bonds, whether a childish fear and undue dominance by father or a childish love and dependence on mother, or both. The boy cannot successfully face life if weighed down by either of these things. He must master both.

Now as to our second point, the development of heterosexuality. By heterosexuality, we mean a healthy, adult level of sexuality in which the primary sex interest of the individual is in the opposite sex. This is something the child must attain. These two problems are, as a matter of

fact, very largely one problem, but for convenience of discussion, we may separate them into two. Over this matter of sex we are greatly concerned. Our anxiety, however, is rather badly placed: it is not fear that the child may fail in accomplishing a healthy development, thereby permanently crippling himself in a very serious and fundamental way, but fear that in the process unpleasant things may happen, things perhaps of importance in themselves, but certainly of secondary importance to the success of the process itself. With failure of the latter, the consequences for the child (and society) are inevitable and permanent; with the former, the permanence and importance are entirely as we choose to make them. So greatly have we magnified the importance of some of these secondary matters that the home, the church, the school, and society generally would seem to be banded together to defeat the child in attaining a healthy sex development.

The child up to this period has not been heterosexual. Its sex life has not been fully developed. There are many issues yet to be solved before we may know just where on the scale of sexual development it is going to find its place. These adolescent years are of the greatest importance. This is the *one* period in the child's life for this process. The one period for *what?* Certainly it is not the one time in life when the contents of high-school textbooks may be learned or the requirements of college-entrance boards satisfied or a dozen and one other responsibilities we load upon the adolescent fulfilled, but these are the only four or five years that he will ever have in all of his life to establish this fundamental thing, his own heterosexuality.

If heterosexuality is not accomplished in these four or five years it never will be accomplished in a normal

way. It may be accomplished later by some technical interference, but then only after much conflict, failure, and illness. These four or five years hold the only chance the average boy and girl will have to establish their heterosexuality. Once prevented, it can never come naturally and normally again. It is a real problem, therefore, that faces the child, in spite of the importance of college-entrance examinations just ahead that face the parents.

We tried for a time to protect ourselves and children (it really amounted to an attempt to defeat the effort of the child to establish its heterosexuality) by keeping them completely ignorant of all sex matters. The tragic results of this no one knows quite so well as the psychiatrist. Even people generally are now awake to the consequences that have followed and efforts are not now so commonly made to keep individuals in ignorance until the night they are married.

But there are bars we still do put up. Heterosexuality cannot be attained in a vacuum. It cannot be attained by itself. It does not just happen; it is a development and growth that is nourished and continued by what it feeds upon. Heterosexuality will be established through contact and experience with those of the opposite sex. Anything, no matter for what purpose, that tends to make this contact too difficult is not in the interest of the child, or the parents or society.

Yet an effort is made, when signs first begin to appear that boys and girls are becoming interested in each other, to keep them apart. We are so fearful that something is going to happen. Nothing—nothing so tragic could happen as that they should fail to accomplish this objective. Nothing! But we are so fearful. We lose sight

of the importance and the necessity of the thing the child is attempting to do and lose ourselves in a round of fears over matters perhaps of importance in themselves, but certainly secondary, with the result that we lose our opportunity to guide and protect and to co-operate with the child in the development and establishment of its heterosexuality. In a panic we try to deny it, to minimize it, to bar it out, to keep it away.

Parents attempt to keep girls away from this boy or boys away from this girl. If unsuccessful, they then attempt very carefully to select the boy or the girl with whom their children may have contact. If done with real insight and understanding, this may be well, but on the other hand, it would be well to let the boy or the girl do a little of the choosing, for after all it is their psychology that has to be handled, not the parents' psychology.

The girl or the boy who may satisfy the parents' emotional needs may be entirely unsatisfactory for the needs of the boy or girl. While we may well be careful here, a great deal of latitude is wise. And if we find that our adolescent boy has been out late some evening with someone who lives on the other side of town and of whom, therefore, we cannot thoroughly approve, we may keep a weather eye open to this, but we are not justied in "hitting the roof." Without any "harm" to himself he will probably have learned more in that little contact that will be helpful to him than he did at the very nicely supervised dance that was given the week before.

We try to force upon these youngsters very unhealthy ideals. Here again I let myself in for misunderstanding, but I do not see that it can be avoided. Some very unhealthy ideals have grown up in the world around this

matter of sex, based largely on fears coming from a lack of understanding and philosophies of life constructed out of ignorance. One of the worst is this—the idealization of women themselves, the placing of women upon pedestals as something too fine, too sacred, too fragile to be handled in anything but the most genteel, considerate way.

A boy is taught, in the first place, that matters of sex are degrading, wrong, and sinful (at least for him and probably a little bit for everybody), but this teaching being not altogether successful, we further try to "protect" him by creating in him an attitude toward women that we think will make him "safe." We teach him that in his consideration of women, he must keep in mind his mother and sister; that he must not say or think or act in any way with another woman that he would not say, think, or act with his mother or sister, or want them to know about.

These are frighfully unhealthy ideas. Tremendous damage is done by them. Here again nobody knows as does the psychiatrist how devastating the damage has been to thousands of men and women, through this utterly false ideal. Women are not the fragile, delicate, sacred little things that they have been pictured. Women are human, vigorous individuals who can pretty well handle themselves.

While it is perfectly right to point out to boys that under certain circumstances women must be carefully guarded and protected, it is wrong to put into their adolescent minds at the critical time when they are normally, healthfully approaching the development of their heterosexuality that women must not be thought of in any way except as they would think of their mothers and sisters.

This is one of the chief causes for the failure of the

establishment of heterosexuality on the part of the boy which interferes later with his married life, which drives him to prostitution, which drives him to abnormal sex expression and to those twists and quirks of personality and character that go deep in his life and fundamentally change and frequently ruin it.

Equally unhealthy ideas are foisted upon girls in regard to the depravity of men and the great care that they must use, therefore, in protecting themselves from the sexual attacks of men. In order to "protect" them they are so filled with fears that they are seriously handicapped even in everyday social relationships and their heterosexual development, necessary in happy marital relations, successful motherhood, and all adult social contacts, is defeated.

Through fears growing out of obviously mistaken ideas as to what sort of beings human beings are and what our goals in life should be, there has grown up a notion that sexual purity is valuable as an end in itself. A quality or condition may have a social value without being valuable as an end in itself. If purity, either of men or women, is useful in keeping society properly organized and stabilized, then it has a social value, but it does not follow that purity as an end in itself is valuable. The value of the first does not close the door to a study of the second and when we come to separate these, we may find that purity as an end in itself may be not only not socially valuable but socially harmful to a degree that will surprise us.

A few years ago a traveling salesman, thirty-nine years of age, committed suicide in a rural New England hotel. He left a letter for his mother in which he expressed

his love for her, his regret at the sorrow that what he was about to do would bring to her, but explaining that he could not face life and his failure any longer. He closed his letter with the sentence, "Anyway, mother, I remained a pure boy." Are we supposed to rejoice at this, to sing hosannas over this man's "victory"? Could anything be more tragic than this man's feeling that the most important thing in his whole life was that he should remain a "pure" man? Would it have been more tragic had he not remained "pure"? We cannot rejoice over this "victory." We can see in it only the tragic frustration, due to a failure to emancipate himself from a childish dependence upon his mother and to his failure to establish an adult heterosexuality, which made a normal, healthy home and marital life with its train of satisfaction, happiness, and success, personal and social, impossible and brought only despair, failure, and death.

Purity on this basis is not a fine thing. And in our efforts to keep boys and girls pure, let us not force upon them a spurious purity which is not purity, but a disease.

Let me reiterate that I am not advocating license, or unlimited freedom among adolescents or any other group, but I do mean this: that if accidents happen in the effort of adolescents to establish their heterosexuality, the disgrace and humiliation that follow are only because we feel it, because we make it so, not really.

There are good, social reasons for guarding carefully the developing sex life of adolescents and guard them wisely we should, but if in the difficult process through which they are going things do happen, it is better that they do and heterosexuality be established than that they should not happen and ill health and abnormality be the

result. I do not say that only one of the two things can happen, but if in this highly charged situation something does happen, nothing really serious has happened until we make it so. Parents should keep that in mind. By our present methods we frequently offer a child but one of the two alternatives.

When adolescents try to make contacts with each other in their fumbling, awkward way, we tend to regard the whole business either with great suspicion or with levity. Instead of seeing the real significance and beauty—and there is nothing so beautiful as this first romanticism of boys and girls in their groping toward an adult heterosexual life; there is probably no love quite so beautiful, if impermanent, no relationship ever later in life quite so charming, quite so lovely, quite so unself-conscious, so spontaneous and uncalculating as this—and instead of seeing these qualities in it, we degrade it to our own level and see only what is common and vulgar.

You cannot convince these boys and these girls that what has been happening within them and between them is common and vulgar, for down in the depths of their hearts, they know that it wasn't. Never has life seemed so fine or so full of wonderment, never have things seemed so precious or virtues they have been inclined to scorn seemed so desirable, never have they felt so generous or so kindly disposed as in these new emotional relationships. You only alienate and you only defeat your own purposes when you try to make base what really has beauty and health and naturalness, but which unfortunately can't be freely exercised because of the complex society in which we must live. You do not convince the child but you can so coerce him as to make him self-conscious, secretive and guilty

and finally calculating, vulgar, base and unhealthy. The opposite attitude of taking all too lightly and poking fun at his emotional experiences is also unfortunate.

These are some of the bars we have put up to defeat the attainment of heterosexuality upon the part of adolescents. To protect them from mud puddles, we cause them to fall into a pit from which they cannot dig themselves out.

In facing the world then, every adolescent, in spite of all the complex problems we give him, most of which are artificial or only relatively important, has only two problems really. One is to emancipate himself from the home, and the other is to establish his heterosexuality. Upon the success of these two accomplishments will depend all the future relationships that he will have with men as he goes out into the world to deal with men, that he will have with women as he meets them about the world; it will have much to do with his choice of a profession, much to do with his success or failure in his profession, everything in the world to do with the success of his marriage. Upon this will depend also his excellence as a parent and as a citizen, his attitude toward public questions such as morals, ethics, religion, and public policy, his general efficiency, his mental and physical health.

If he does not accomplish this emancipation and this heterosexuality, his relationships to men and women cannot be upon a normal, healthy basis but can only be confused; his marriage can at best be but a partial success—most likely a failure, whether acknowledged or endured; through his parenthood he will distort the life of his children, handicapping them as he has been handicapped; as a citizen, his attitude on public questions of morals, ethics,

religion, and public policy will be determined in relation to his own unsolved problems rather than from the consideration of realities. From such, a sound, satisfactory, healthy moral world cannot come.

So I repeat that the two things that a child must accomplish—and these are the only years of his life that he has in which to accomplish them—are to emancipate himself from the home and to establish his heterosexuality.

TRAINING FOR CHARACTER

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS

Frederic Cambell Woodward, Professor of Law, and Vice-President of the University of Chicago

I am sure it is a source of the deepest gratification to the organizers of this Conference that this dinner meeting is so largely attended. Your presence here is an impressive demonstration of the deep and widespread interest in the subject of the Conference, and a happy augury for the future of Chicago—and not of Chicago alone but of America. For as the child of today is the citizen of tomorrow, so just as surely is the well-nurtured and intelligently trained child of today the good citizen of tomorrow; and it is axiomatic that good citizenship is the one indispensable ingredient in the making of a truly great and happy land.

In assuming the chairmanship of this meeting, I must at the outset disclaim responsibility as an authority in the field of character-training. If I were not a father myself, or if, being a father, I were far from home, I might be tempted to pose as one of the splendid group of experts who have so generously responded to the invitation to participate in the Conference. For one who speaks as an expert is at least listened to with respect. But the presence of many of my friends and neighbors compels me to confess that I am here, personally, in the capacity of one who seeks, not to guide, but for guidance; and that I occupy the chair as the representative of the University of Chicago, of whose interest in and support of this movement I welcome the opportunity to assure you.

As I have suggested, the experience of being a father is one, which, if taken seriously to heart, makes for humility. I suppose that every man, before he becomes a father, is prone to believe that the one requisite of successful fatherhood is that good sturdy common sense, with which, however modest in other respects he may be, he considers himself richly endowed. And I would not disparage the importance of common sense anymore than I would disparage the importance of mother-love, as a factor in the training of the child. But when the father discovers, as he often does, that his common sense, or what he had fondly regarded as his common sense, does not bring the results that he had expected to achieve, one of two things is likely to happen. Either he saves his pride, and perhaps his disposition, by concluding that after all the training of the child is the mother's job—which conclusion he may secretly reinforce with the reflection that since the child has inherited its faults from the mother's side of the family, he is not responsible for them anyway. Or else he takes off his coat of pride and buckles down to what he now realizes is a task which will tax his patience, his resourcefulness, and his self-control.

You may have heard the story of the man on a railway train who was observed to be vigorously pounding his little child on the back. A woman who was a fellow-passenger, indignant at what looked to her like a brutal beating, remonstrated with him, declaring that if he didn't stop beating the child she would make trouble for him. "Madam," replied the man, "my oldest child has been expelled from school for stealing; my second child is quarantined with the measles; and this youngster across my

knee has just swallowed a safety-pin. *You can't make trouble for me!"*

The heart of every father must go out in understanding sympathy to the harrassed soul of the hero of this affecting tale.

Of course the father normally does not face his task alone. He has the co-operation of the mother; or, to put the emphasis in the right place, the mother has his co-operation. But even this co-operation is sometimes difficult to maintain. For it involves not only mutual confidence and good will but the ability graciously to accept and heartily to act upon the judgment of another—another whom one does not honestly consider one's superior in intelligence. I have not doubt that the happiness of many a husband and wife has come to shipwreck upon this rock. There is the story of the man who married a saleswoman in Marshall Field's store, to whom he had been first attracted by the courtesy and kindliness with which she had assisted him in some difficult shopping. All went merrily until a baby came and for a time thereafter. But when the youngster became a problem and the father and mother disagreed as to the proper method of dealing with the problem, the father confessed to an old friend that there were moments when he wished that he had done his shopping at Mandel's instead of Field's.

But assuming the successful co-operation of the parents, they will sometimes find themselves baffled. They will learn that children are not little men and women; that they are strange little creatures whose psychology it is difficult for grown-ups to understand. President Mason tells a story of his experience with a young dog which illustrates my point. The dog was somewhat indisposed and

the veterinary had prescribed castor oil. Dr. Mason expected to have a struggle when he attempted to administer the dose, so he summoned the whole family to hold the pup down. When all was ready he forced the medicine into the poor beast's mouth, and then ordered the family to release him. The dog jumped up, wagging his tail, and began eagerly to lick the spoon which Dr. Mason still held in his hand. So it often is with children. In tastes and impulses and emotional reactions they differ disconcertingly from our preconceptions. Bad habits are quickly formed and distressingly hard to break. Astonishing traits of character appear, apparently from thin air, and strenuously resist eradication.

Then it is that the wise parent of today seeks the expert. In this age of specialization, there are many intelligent men and women, fortunately, who as educators, psychologists, and psychiatrists, are devoting their lives to the study of the child—not of the abnormal and subnormal child alone, but of the normal child—the normal child of normal parents living in a normal environment. The purpose of this conference is to disseminate the knowledge of these men and women. And the purpose of the Association for Child Study and Parent Education is to disseminate such knowledge through small groups of parents who gather from time to time in their respective communities. There are, I believe, twelve such groups in Chicago today. There ought to be hundreds of them. There ought to be, and I hope there soon will be, a body of university trained women who are especially equipped to interpret the work of the experts to the parents and to carry back to the experts the results of their experience.

We are, I believe, on the threshold of an era in which

knowledge of the art and science of child-training will be vastly increased. The motto of the University comes to my mind. *Crescat scientia vita excolatur*—"Let knowledge grow that life may be enriched." Let the knowledge of parents grow that the lives of their children may be enriched; that in the precious formative years the little kinks of habit and character may be straightened out, and the children set, with shining faces, upon the road to happiness—the road to honorable lives and useful service.

THE FATHER'S RESPONSIBILITY IN THE TRAINING OF HIS CHILDREN

Henry Neumann, Author of "Education for Moral Growth" and Leader, Brooklyn Society for Ethical Culture

Bringing up children today is harder than it used to be. Life is more complex; and the business of rearing the young requires all the best of all the brains that can be brought to bear upon the problems. The business man knows that he cannot trust the conduct of his affairs to hit-or-miss salesmanship or financing, but must take long looks ahead and call to his aid every available bit of useful counsel. Is the job of training boys and girls any less in need of the combination of good hard sense and sound information? What would it not mean if even a sizable fraction of the energy and intelligence put into business went into working out with the mothers the best ways of living for and with the boys and girls? Many widows bring up excellent children; but for all their success, they know that they could have done better with the life-long co-operation of their partners.

On the surface it would seem that what the father brings to the mental and moral nurture of the family is negligible. The relation of child and mother is indeed closer in every way. The wife is usually so completely the parent that she can be little else; but her husband has his livelihood, his citizenship, half-a-dozen concerns outside of his fatherhood, to occupy him. Parentage in and of itself, therefore, he is less likely to take as seriously as she does.

Perhaps the chief difficulty rises from the father's

thinking that he can be absolved from other duties toward the home because he must put his main energies into money-making. Many an excellent man is tempted to forget that the best offering he can make his children is himself. He comes home from work late and fatigued. To spend time with his boys and girls and interest himself properly in their problems is often impossible for the man who has been harassed to the point of extreme irritability. In thousands of homes, there is a kind of jealousy on the part of the wife which is quite justifiable. She knows her husband's gifts, and she sees him spend them—where? On his home? It is in his job outside that he is so energetic and resourceful; and what he brings home is a brain too tired to be used with anything like the same vigor for the good of his children.

And yet even busy men can find time for the things they want deeply enough. There is an interesting note on this theme in the autobiography of John Stuart Mill. His father, he says, a man who never did anything negligently, managed with all his burdens to occupy himself during ten years with writing a history of India. Nevertheless, declares the son,

> During the whole period a considerable part of almost every day was employed in the instruction of his children. . . . . What he was willing to undergo for the sake of my instruction may be judged from the fact that I went through the whole process of preparing my Greek lessons in the same room and at the same table at which he was writing; and as in those days Greek and English lexicons were not, and I could make no use of a Greek and Latin lexicon, I was forced to have recourse to him for the meaning of every word I did not know. This incessant interruption he, one of the most impatient of men, submitted

to, and wrote under that interruption several volumes of his history and all else that he had to write during those years.

It is significant to have this leader among the nineteenth-century economists record that his father instructed him in political economy "by a sort of lecture which he delivered in our walks." Compare this tribute with a child's remembering his father chiefly as the one who either scolded him, or else played with him (or did both), or as the one who left him a lot of gilt-edge securities.

Suppose now that fathers made the effort—and it is surprising how much can be done when the will is strong—suppose that even if they could not shorten their working-hours, they gave the children more of the time which they spend on meaningless recreation? Admitted that they must get away from their business cares. Here in the company of their children, is an opportunity to do so with lasting profit to all concerned.

What contributions are there which a father can make? Much is gained by the mere fact of his co-operating with the mother. In addition, there are special offerings of his own which he can give. He can bring to the home the best of qualities encouraged by his work outside. What is especially serviceable in the standards by which he judges and is judged there is the test of strict achievement. If he is a doctor, he must cure the sick; if he is a lawyer, he must get justice for his client. Whatever his work, he must make good; for in his world, people are estimated not according to what they dream or promise, but according to what they actually perform. On the other hand, the mother—we are speaking in very general terms—is likely to rate her children more on the promise which

she divines than on their definite accomplishment. Undoubtedly her household work puts upon her, too, the test of strict performance. Nevertheless, in dealing with her boys and girls, she also brings another viewpoint to bear. When her child falls short, she is the more readily inclined to forgiveness, because the mother-love sees the whole child, not simply the present failure. Just as before birth the entire little body was enfolded within hers, so now the whole nature of the child is embraced in her affection. She can love it not chiefly for this or that grace or special aptitude or achievement, but for all that her forward-reaching fondness imagines it may become, forecasting the flower while the bud is still green and hard. That is why the mother is so peculiarly fitted to be the teacher of the very young long before they are at all capable of making good.

Necessary as this evaluation by the mother is, the other stricter standard, however, is likewise essential. Dear as even the failure is to the mother-heart, life calls upon the child, in the language of the business world, to deliver the goods. It must be a proficient student, the right kind of neighbor, a reliable worker. For all its delightful promise, it has very definite occasions where it must toe the mark. Hence the need for supplementing the mother-standard by strict insistence upon present accomplishment. Where should we be if we lost the qualities that make it possible to get the world's work done and not simply hoped for?

Here then is one of the offerings which the father can contribute from his life in the hard world outside. Not at all that the attitude which judges a child for what it promises to be is one whit less necessary. At every stage

of life, both standards are required. All of us are rightly held accountable for certain very definite measures of achievement; and at the same time we are entitled to be judged for what we are not as yet but only may become. In the ideal home, these two methods of evaluation work hand in hand, each supplementing the other. It is quite possible for a father or a mother alone to be skilled in both kinds. As a general thing, however, the two viewpoints are likely to be different; and the children need both.

The second distinct contribution by the father is the lesson of his broader practical acquaintance with men and affairs. The mother's world is in some respects physically narrower than his. Often—and again there are many exceptions—it is out of the question for her to get his first-hand experience with business and with large world-problems, or to be thrown into contact like his with all sorts of conditions and persons. Her excursions are apt to be larger and more varied in the world which is unseen of the bodily eye. The father, on the other hand, is apt to be more direct in his outlook upon life, more immediately practical, less given to the imaginings, for instance, which make the charm of literature.

For that very reason he has much to bring to his home —not the heavy-footed disenchantment which tramples upon the child's imaginative creations, but the sounder lessons of his hard experiences, such a lesson, for example, as the need of seeing certain facts without illusion and interpreting them broadly and objectively. I think in this connection of what was told to me by an exceedingly capable woman, an able mother who is at the same time a social reformer with a broad vision and a good grasp upon the

actual difficulties of her aims. She told me that much of her understanding of life she owed to her father, a successful man of business. She never went to college, but she received in her youth what no college could have given her so well. She used to walk to school with her father on his way to business, and in these conversations she learned the man's point of view about business, about what men think of women, about politics and world-affairs, the problems of the day, in short, as they looked to a man who had his ideals and his hard contacts with the world too. This is an instance of the father's contribution from his special experiences with the larger affairs outside—the solidity no less essential than the fineness.

A third special offering is the father's chance to teach his sons the right attitude toward women. This does not concern chiefly the need of clean views upon the subject of sex, although it may be said in passing that this instruction is far more the duty of the home than of the school. The average father may plead that here he is without the particular skill required by the teacher; but if he has the affection and the confidence of his sons, he possesses what the ordinary teacher is less likely to enjoy; and with this invaluable fund to begin with, he can readily enough acquire the minor details of method.

The more inclusive consideration, however, is the lesson of respect for womankind taught by the father's own example at home. A son may become a poor husband because of his father's failure. And such failure, need we say, may occur even when it does not include wife-beating? There is still a chivalry which is by no means altogether out-moded.

Again, the father can do much to keep his sons from

thinking that all idealism is something to be scorned as womanish. Many a lad, interested early in his life in culture, comes to think that to be red-blooded he must turn his back on that sort of thing. He is less likely to take so foolish a view when his father cultivates these finer interests. For the same reason, one cannot help wishing that more fathers took an active part in movements for world-peace. Why should such efforts be promoted chiefly by women? If the world is to move on to a day where the nations settle their differences by something better than wading through slaughter, why are not more fathers willing to be counted among the supporters of such a view? Some perhaps are afraid of being thought unmanly. May it not, however, be still more manly to let yourself be counted among the minority who champion a sorely needed ideal? Here the father can be of no slight helpfulness as the teacher of his sons.

What, in return, does the father get from all this participation in the training of his children? The consequence is a certain broadening influence which makes the child in a very real sense a civilizer, the savior of its own parents.

The influence of the child upon its parents begins even before it is born. It is a poor type of male who does not respond to the appeal of the mother's helplessness in those months before the birth and after. Now, even if at no other time, the man must be specially the protector, not simply against outside harm, but against his own uncivilized nature. If there is any gentleness in his make-up, now is the occasion to show it, and by exercising it, to deepen it, as all our capabilities are intensified by use. The social significance of this fact is far-reaching. It

would pay us to read John Fiske's *Meaning of Infancy* again to remember how this necessity for looking after the family helped to modify man's roving disposition, to attach him to his home, and so to build up the institution on which society now rests.

The child's influence extends, and should be encouraged to do so, over all the father's life. Once the child is able to talk, how much it teaches the father! What is a man to do when he has a reputation for wisdom to maintain but cannot answer questions about butterflies and airplanes and why Christmas trees always stay green? He must hark back to his own school days, to a renewed interest in geography, history, nature study, literature. He must recall old songs and even become poet and composer when a halting recollection obliges him to invent new words and new tunes. He must go back to old games; and he gets down on his hands and knees again—a more excellent tonic than his expensive gymnasium can give. By being a make-believe bear for a few moments he is less likely to be a real one at other times. So the civilizing process continues through his life. When his children grow older and the problems of high school or vocation call upon him and his wife for their most careful thought, he cannot remain the overspecialized creature that his work tends to make of him.

In general it is impossible for the father who takes his parenthood seriously to remain unaffected for the better. He cannot help putting to himself the most searching questions about the whole of his life outside the home or within. If, for instance, the strain of the daily labors leaves him and other fathers too tired to interest themselves as they should in their children's upbringing, that

is, if work as carried on today makes men worse parents, then what should they try to make business become? Or if the main thing which a father can give his children is not his money, then what is he in business for? That is a fundamental question, a religious question if you will; and the greatest service which a child can offer its parents is to make them put to themselves questions of that very sort. No man can be genuinely a father without getting these glimpses into worthier living in general.

There is a scene in *The Mill on the Floss* which aptly illustrates this effect. Mr. Tulliver has two children, Maggie, the special treasure of his heart, and Tom, who is more or less kind to his sister but in the main apt to be too strict. Tulliver, who is hard pushed for cash, visits his married sister to collect a debt of three hundred pounds which is long overdue, but which, because of the straitened circumstances in the Moss household, he has foreborne to press. Quite innocently Mrs. Moss speaks with fondness of his Maggie, "the little wench"; but when she refers to her own four boys and four girls, Mr. Tulliver hints rather broadly that "girls must fend for themselves, they must not look to hanging on their brothers." "No," Mrs. Moss answers; "but I hope their brothers'll love the poor things —not but what I hope your boy 'ull allays be good to his sister." Mr. Tulliver then comes to the point and insists, in spite of hard times, upon having his money. But on the homeward ride his sister's allusions to Maggie continually recur. "Poor little wench! She'll have nobody but Tom belike when I'm gone." And even now Tom is inclined to be hard with her. The upshot is that almost without realizing the fact, he turns his horse back to the Moss home. He

finds his sister still crying. "There, there," he says, "don't you fret. I'll make a shift without the money a bit."

Many a father, perhaps without full awareness of the reason, has been touched to greater considerateness by love for his child. The world needs a conscious extending of that spirit. As parenthood taken seriously makes the man a better husband, so should it likewise make him the better citizen. It should reveal to him the claims of other children than his own, denied the wholesome influences granted to his boys and girls, the claims of the countless parents no less anxious than himself to make excellent persons of their sons and daughters, but thwarted by unfriendly circumstance. The world is entering, we trust, upon a new era to be characterized by greater fair play in its competitions, greater mercy toward the handicapped, greater consideration in general. The special fitness of women for the furthering of this task is made much of by the advocates of woman's suffrage. But it is an error to say that the inauguration of this better day is the work of the world's mothers. It is no less the work of the world's fathers. It will be done better when men and women undertake it jointly. For the fathers themselves it will be a benefit when this is what their parenthood makes of them.

Finally, a right attitude toward fatherhood, an appreciation of what the man is specially fitted to give to the home and of what he can make of himself through the proper exercise of his function, would go a long way toward cleaning up prevailing misconceptions on the subject of marriage and divorce.

Those who advocate the state care of children whose parents have separated overlook not only the child's need of both parents, but the good effects wrought upon the

fathers and mothers themselves through the carrying of their responsibilities. What mothers thus make of themselves is readily admitted. Is the development of personality on the father any less important? The home is peculiarly the hearth where the pieties of life are kindled and kept burning. It offers a unique opportunity for all its members, parents no less than children, to be trained in the fundamental loyalties; and for this purpose it requires the gifts of both parents in constant interaction. Partnerships in marriage will not be changed lightly when fathers and mothers take to heart the life-long need their children have for all the best that both parents can give.

THE RELATION OF INTELLIGENCE TO CHARACTER

Dr. Ira S. Wile, Associate in Pediatrics, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York City

Much has been said upon the subject of intelligence during recent years. Each writer and speaker views the subject more or less from his own standpoint. Some, for one reason or another, regard the head as the most important part of the body. For example, there was an old barber who, while he was carefully shampooing the head of one of his customers, remarked, "You have a very large head; it is a fine thing to have a large head; it means you have a large brain; it is a fine thing to have a large brain, because it nourishes the roots of the hair." Everyone does not find in heads just that particular degree of worth and value, but all who are interested in education or in health, in child nurture or welfare, have given some consideration to the subject of intelligence.

Intelligence and character! What is intelligence? Let me present the terms with which we are dealing in the light of their meanings as I shall apply them tonight. Intelligence is generally regarded as learning ability. Some children learn more, and some learn less, but both types possess intelligence. The most intelligent do not always learn the most; sometimes the less intelligent apply themselves more industriously and walk away with the prizes.

Another aspect of intelligence lies in its definition as the capacity to adapt one's self to new situations, to novel situations in life; the ability to grasp things—not with the

hands, but with the mind. Very frequently those who grasp easily with the mind also grasp well with the hands. Intelligence is defined by another group as a problem-solving ability; by still others it is held to be merely directed thinking. Many deem judgment to be one of the elements of intellectual action essential in shaping character; whereas others believe that the degree of judgment requisite to develop character is not particularly great.

Character is variously defined. As we ordinarily employ the word we think of it in its positive and advantageous phases, although we all sometimes speak of bad character as well as good character. Character is generally regarded as one's moral force, or influence, the complement of man's ethical concepts and traits, regardless of whether they are native or acquired.

One definition of character rather interests me. It is by an English psychologist, Dr. Cyril Burt, who defines character as "The sum total of those personal qualities of mind which do not constitute, or are not pervaded by intelligence. They are marked by feeling rather than by knowledge; by will rather than by skill." That is a definition in which character is not given very much grace or sanction on the basis of intellect.

Roback's definition of character is somewhat arresting —a definition that says it is "an enduring psycho-physical disposition to inhibit instinctive impulses in accordance with a regulative principle." That is tantamount to saying that we evidence intelligence in action by the things that we do not do far more than by the things that we do. Certainly the great process of socialization, the great values which are achieved through the demonstration of character, arise from the non-performance of many things

which we feel impelled to do. The stress properly falls on self-control, the denial of self, the refusal to act upon impulse, and our general willingness to inhibit things in the interest of the large social group.

There is a variety of opinions, I am quite frank to admit, but none is so insistent as those relating to intelligence quotients, as many speak of the Intelligence Quotient as though it had some peculiar sacrosanct significance, as though it were the dominating thing in life—a strange mechanism to conjure with. If there is a high I.Q. all the rest of the world can go hang—sometimes one can hang, too, with a most superior I.Q.

Many years ago, Dr. Goddard, from his work with the feeble-minded, came to the conclusion that approximately 50 per cent of criminals were defectives. It is only fair to say that most of the humans whom Dr. Goddard studied were confined in institutions; and one can understand that the more defective group would be there. He did not make his studies in any halls of legislation. He even went so far as to say, "It is not a question of stature or age, but of mentality that determines an individual's conduct."

Mental competency is indispensable to moral responsibility; but if mental competency is to be interpreted solely as intelligence, then I think that the practical standards of the world represent higher competency than could be expected from the results of the psychological examinations of military draftees. The intelligence levels were not as high as the educational group had hoped to find. The moral levels could not be postulated from the intelligence levels.

On the other hand, a psychiatrist, Dr. Campbell, of the Boston Psychopathic Hospital, after noting: "The dynamic elements involved in the relationship of one human to another are among the most primitive and deep-rooted forces in human nature," frankly goes on to say, "In this relationship the intelligence plays but a small part."

You may choose between the attitude of the psychiatrist and that of equally vigorous thinkers as to the part which intelligence really plays in the development of character.

Dr. Terman, with a special interest in gifted children, has made a very careful genetic study of 1,000 geniuses on the western coast, but he was not able to find that they were particularly superior in character. He did find a rather high correlation between these magnificent intellects and their traits and dispositions, but he was frank to admit that possibly 20 per cent of this gifted group had more defects in character than the average child in the community. That is not a very strong correlation for highest intelligence and highest standards of character. However, even that is not so bad, when one bears in mind the dictum of Dr. Murchison, from Dr. Burnham's excellent institution, in the striking sentence: "Intelligence is just as serious a problem for criminology as is feeble-mindedness." This bids us stop, look, and listen.

I am emphasizing the status of the intelligence quotient because so much has been said about it that would lead one to believe that those who lack a superior mentality are inferior in other respects. The intellectual capacity of an individual as detected by tests now utilized does not yield a measure of his mind, nor afford a complete sur-

vey of his personality. The test material is useful to indicate but one phase of human personality—the capacity to adapt to new situations. The tests do not reveal spontaneity of interest, of initiative, of enthusiasm, or sense of moral responsibility. They give little insight into the real springs of feeling and action of the child who is tested. Therefore, we have to seek for some explanations of character other than in terms of intelligence quotients. I would not go so far as Professor Herbert Martin in his study, *Formative Foundations of Character*: "Intelligence has long been regarded not only as of doubtful worth in the realm of morals, but as an altogether perilous possession. Knowledge and moral peril vary directly."

I almost hesitate to quote Martin to an audience such as this, which I must assume to possess considerable knowledge. On the other hand, I am reminded of that rare discussion about knowledge and intelligence that was held some time ago. One man asked another how to distinguish between intelligence and knowledge, and this is what he replied: "Well, now, I'll tell you. Intelligence is that capacity of the human mind which enables a man to succeed in life without knowledge; and knowledge is that sum of learning in the human mind which enables one to succeed without intelligence." These obvious distinctions are sometimes regarded as having a definite place in fostering character-development; it is often urged that mere knowledge is productive of character or that mere intelligence is productive of character. Obviously, the inherited capacity for intellectual action is existent at birth; it can never rise above its source. It rarely is developed to the point of promise in the egg. Knowledge is not synony-

mous with intelligence but is dependent upon the utilization of intelligence.

Character is not so static. It is dynamic. It is in a state of flux—in a state of change—in a state of constant shifting. It is not as enduring in practical living as it is in theory. It is something that is constantly modified by new contacts with persons and objects, by new situations, new temptations, new opportunities, and new realizations. Ordinarily human behavior as we find it in human society is an indefinite mixture rather than a real synthesis of elements. It has a large portion of instinct in it as well as intelligence. We must bear in mind that the instinctive elements are not so easily determinable as is the intellectual component. While we may be able to predict something from a knowledge of the intellectual capacity, we are rather hampered in predicting character without a fuller knowledge of the instinctive forces and the degree of their development and control.

Of course it would be ideal were it possible for the instincts to be constantly controlled by rational thinking, but man is not quite so rational a being at all times as he is wont to consider himself. That common sense, which has already been referred to, upon which the race prides itself, is called common sense largely because it is so uncommon.

There are great differences, then, in the mental endowment of individuals, whether children or adults. It is not all a question of knowledge. You may recall that story of the social worker down in the South who was doing child welfare work. She was going around about, and she finally came to an old colored woman who had had a large family. They were all living and they were all lively and

happy, and this nurse asked the old colored woman how it happened that she had succeeded in raising this numerous progeny with such success, and with such eminent satisfaction apparently both to the children and to herself. The poor old mammy scratched her head a moment and then said, "Well, you see, I never went to college so I just naturally had to use my common sense." Her accomplishments were not based upon an application to books, or to theoretic material which she had gathered from government pamphlets, or from other sources, but they were the result of a character in herself that followed out some of the instinctive traits of fine motherhood, combined with what she termed "common sense."

There is a great deal of difference between the capacity for organizing one's experience and the willingness to organize it for the benefit of society. And character involves just as much a contemplation of the needs of society and one's responsibility to society as it does the element that has been referred to as the capacity to organize experience. Desire and character are not wholly reciprocal, and some of the outstanding men of history are those in whom character in one sense is not highly esteemed. Cellini, for example, was a strong character, very strong, and intellectual; but he did not organize his experience in the interests of the general community. Villon was a poet, a splendid poet, of ample intellectual capacity, but with little capacity for organizing in terms of social responsibility. Indeed, it seems to me that I have heard the character of George Washington recently questioned; but think what his character would have been down the ages had the Revolutionary War been unsuccessful, and had he been merely a rebellious subject of George the Third!

His character would not have been that which our history has given him. Hence, it is evident that the time, and the place, and the social demand help to determine both the character of character and the reputation for character. More or less, during the whole history of man, as Draper long ago pointed out, we find that the intellectual has always led the way in social advancement, while the moral elements have constantly been subordinated to it. That held true during the Middle Ages, during the years of feudalism, and even during those delightful days of chivalry. The intellectual element ever has been a dominant one. That may be one of the factors that accounts for the general character as we have it today. The intellectual moiety has not been crystallized into social service and utility but has striven on a plane apart and has not functioned adequately for the production of moral standards of character.

The instincts have long been regarded as playing a leading part in man's slow progress, and I cannot but quote these lines of Huxley, written many years ago, in which there was a distinct note of optimism. He remarked, "The intelligence which has converted the brother of the wolf into the faithful guardian of the flock ought to be able to do something toward curbing the instincts of savagery in civilized man." And Huxley saved himself by saying, "ought to," because, thus far, it has not been successful.

If one agrees with Jastrow that "moral education is the diversion of primitive energetic impulse into wholesome channels," then we must question a great deal of the evolution of character as it has come down to us.

I hesitate to speak of evolution in this age when fun-

damentalist is warring against modernist, and so I will confine my remarks on that subject to a little quatrain indicating what evolution really means:

"Evolution," quoth the monkey,
Makes all mankind our kin.
There's no doubt at all about it.
Tails we lost—heads we win."

In addition to a consideration of the instincts isolated or grouped, which enter into character, one must contemplate the influence of the emotions. Dr. Neumann has referred to them as at times handicapping the efficiency of fathers. The feelings which lead, guide, or disturb reason, or may even drive it out entirely and the feelings which are generated and goaded by reason, perform a star part in the play of character, irrespective of the intelligence of the person who has the feeling to control. Reason may reinforce or justify our decisions, but it does not as frequently inspire them as do our deeper emotions.

It is the motor part of the emotion that dominates most of the vitality of character. Habits and training, therefore, are of notable worth. Lack of intellect possesses negative rather than positive value. Frequently it is more difficult to instil desired habits in a child because of his active intelligence while it is easier for him to acquire other habits in greater harmony with his own desires.

Some habits of speech are rapidly formed by children, especially in the use of language that is not taught through the subject of grammar. For proficiency in the use of expletives one does not have to give courses running through the grades.

Habits are in many ways dependent upon intelligence, but let us remember that intelligence also more easily permits or even leads to the shifting of habits to meet the demands of impulses, and to meet the demands of new motives in life. Intelligence inspires the methods by which habits are established rather than the motive for their establishment. Both intelligence and habits are requisite for social adaptation.

When one speaks of habits of learning and memorizing, one must remember the facility with which children explain away their losses of memory. A short time ago a little girl had been invited to play at a musicale given by her music teacher, and she sat down to the piano. She had two pieces to play and she played the first very, very badly, getting the first part mixed with the second. After that she played the second selection, and not even as well as the previous one. After it was over the teacher said, "Now, how did you happen to play those quite the way that you did? I have heard you play them better." The child replied, "The first one I had so long ago that I had forgotten it, and the second one I have not had long enough to remember yet."

As we discuss character, let us remember that we, ourselves, are altering values as to the essential desirable traits of character. With all the intellectual capacity of the Greeks they treated their aged shamefully and negligently, whereas the North American Indian, without such claims to intellectual life and activity, reverenced their old people. One may recognize the distinction between a religion and character code founded upon ancestor worship, and one that has not hesitated to do away with the older generation in order to make it easier for

the tribe to march. Our social restraints and our requirements are ever changing our activities and at the same time shifting and readjusting our standards of behavior. The moral ideas of an age form part of the social ideas of that age. The validity of our ideas of character can only be interpreted in terms of our social conditions, social acceptances, and our social taboos. The standards of character during a time of war are not the standards of a time of peace. To steal during peace time is to bring opprobrium, but to steal during war times, if it be the plans of the enemy, brings credit for the attributes of courage, valor, and daring. Lying and spying in time of war are rewarded, but lying and espionage during times of peace are considered reprehensible.

We hear much nervous comment concerning the character of the youth of today. The character of youth of today is no different from the character of those whose youth must be mentioned in a past tense. I recall an enlightening little experience which is fraught with a significant message. A man was complaining to me about his daughter and objected that times had changed. He said, "I recall the time when my dear mother was an old lady, and there was a chair which was her chair. No child would think of sitting in that particular chair. At night after supper every one including the grandchildren, would remain standing until she had sat down. Then the young folks, one after the other, would talk to her and tell her where they were going, and what time they expected to return, they expressed the hope that she would have a good night's rest, and quite naturally added that they would tell her all about it in the morning." I could endure no more. "See here," I said, "if you will show me grandmothers sitting

around like that, I'll show you grandchildren doing the same sort of thing!"

Youth has not changed any more than age has changed, except to this extent—the old have grown younger, and the young have grown older. As a result we have a different conflict, because the old who have grown younger are thinking in terms of their youth when they were still younger, and much younger than the generation that is slowly aging before them.

Sometimes we talk about how we used to sit at home at night and read. Of course we did—there were few places of pleasure to visit. We usually came home early. Of course, the trolleys stopped running at eleven or twelve, and there were no taxis. We tell of how we never did this or that—we speak less often of what we did do. Had we had the good fortune to be born when our children were born we would in all likelihood be just like them. They have the same blood, the same impulses, emotions, and desires that we had, but they are living in a different world, with different opportunities for their realization, with different traditions, altered customs and mores. They were exposed to the blight of a war situation which helped break down countless barriers that formerly were held in respect. They are living in a time when women have the vote, when the industrialism of women is more complete than ever before, when there is more mechanization of life, when most of the educative values have gone out of the home, not always excepting the parents. We have taken the raw materials of life, from an educational standpoint, out of the home. Indeed in many homes it is deemed hazardous for the child to undertake practical household arts

because the cook or the chambermaid does not like it, and it is easier to deny the children than the cook or maid.

Let us be fair. Our characters have changed because our conditions have changed. We were not brought up in an age of cinemas and speedy automobiles, of telephones and easy date-making. We were subjected to a less elaborate system of education and a less vigorous compulsory educational law. What we face at the present time is a stage of transition and adaptation of youth to a world that it does not understand; and parents do not understand youth or the world either. Undoubtedly there are dangers, but let us not lose faith because character seems to be changing in some ways. The plaints of today were not unknown in the days of Isaiah; and they have been called out from time immemorial at repeated intervals when new institutions have arisen and have changed the standards and customs of the age. There is a danger, it is true, that some of the new experiences, this new freedom, with new access to a larger and more unrestrained literature which is swallowed undigested, may give rise to a little mental dyspepsia. There may be a temporary reaction of seeming enjoyment, but I have no doubt that another change will occur when the novelty has worn off. In the words of a nineteen-year old girl, "I wonder what the next generation *can* do?"

Since we are talking in terms of intelligence, has this present age more intelligence? No! Yes! Depending upon how you look at it. The younger generation has no less intelligence than their parents; and yet we are trying to point out distinctions in character and at the time endeavoring to maintain the thesis that intelligence is the main element in character. The real strength of character

is in the present youth! They have courage; they have initiative; they have strength. They ring true; they speak the truth, fearlessly, and painfully at times to their parents. They know what they want better than the earlier generation did, because they are doing their own thinking. Their thoughts as to who they are, what they are, and what they are to be are not merely the acceptance of the gracious advice of their elders. There is a herd consciousness in youth that recognizes its place; and so we witness a youth movement spreading throughout the various countries of the globe.

But man is more of an individual and is more honest as an individual when he protests than when he conforms. Only a simple unreasoning nature accepts everything that the world says as a 100 per cent true, but an intelligent thinking being challenges it and applies cold, merciless logic to it. Thus we find ourselves doubting youths' character because they are doubting. Youth shows character because it is questioning. A finer and a more vigorous strength of character arises when a man's thoughts and his actions are in accordance with his intellectual processes; when he thinks before he accepts, rather than after.

There may be fewer young people joining some good movement; there may be some difficulty in getting them into the church; there may be some friction in converting them to many of our ideas, but they will make a church of their own which will meet their needs and demands. The great problem confronting the church today is how to make our church traditions conform to the desires and the needs of an altered age and generation. But the churches are slowly making the requisite changes. Youth is considering churchliness in the sense of the brotherhood of man,

and through that they are gaining some idea of the fatherhood of God; and it is not merely an intuition, or a repeated dogma.

Let us for a moment recognize, then, that individual character is somewhat determined by the collective actions of communities, and that these collective actions are embodied in codes and standards, rules, customs, and mores. When these social dicta are accepted intellectually, then they become our ideals; and our ideals are intellectual abstractions of which we approve, even though we do not always follow them.

There are many who believe that most of the problems relating to character-development have arisen from a failure of our educational system, because they think that ethics ought to be developed through a direct appeal to the intelligence. For example, we have been having considerable discussion in New York City as to whether the Ten Commandments should be read in school. I think it makes no difference. The Ten Commandments have been well advertised and preached for a number of generations. They have not all been followed, although the intellectual appeal has not been lacking. There has been ample evidence of personal indifference, and social violations have hampered their realization, although they are accepted as representing one of the finest codes of moral practice extant. Possibly Sumner was right when he said, "Our faith in the power of book learning is excessive and unfounded. It is a superstition of the age." I hesitate to support this view before an educated community believing in the infinite worth of formal education; but there is a question as to how far and how much of character can be formed and developed through sheer

book influence. Book learning projected toward the intellect alone does not become as fully organized in the being of youth as does the learning that comes through the regulation of emotions, and through the establishment of adequate powers of self-direction and control in and through socialized activity and effortful living.

I regret to say that the same Dr. Murchison, whom I previously quoted, found from a study of prisoners that "there seems to be a positive correlation between the amount of literacy and the amount of recidivism." In a comparison of the second-, third-, fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-term offenders in the prison, he found a higher degree of intelligence than among those who were only first offenders. That observation carries its own sad moral. But it is significant in another direction, that the federal prisoners at Fort Leavenworth during the war, as a group, had a higher intelligence grade than was found among the draftees. That, too, may carry its lesson, considering that so large a proportion of the prisoners were conscientious objectors and pacifists. It is striking (and it is almost humorous) that in one prison at least, where examinations were made, the intelligence of the prisoners was found to be higher than that of their guards. When it comes to feeble-mindedness, Dr. Burt, in his study of delinquents, found that even feeble-minded delinquents have a higher intellectual level than the feeble-minded who are not delinquent. Now all of these interesting statements are simply indicative of what I implied when referring to Dr. Goddard's figures, that interpretation depends on those you are examining, and where you are examining them.

Intelligence occupies an anomalous position because we tend to worship it; we give it values that are actually

greater than those to which it is entitled, particularly in our social relationships. If direct education is not of immense value, what can we do? A large part of character is the result of training. Character is both an end in life and a goal in the training of children, and, curiously enough, I believe that most of it is obtained as a by-product of education. It is gained more through objective opportunities and experience than from subjective appeals and sermonizing comments. It is an acquirement in the course of life and in the course of living, rather than the result of a primary natural endowment. If we seek to develop character, it is necessary for us to find means whereby we can enable individuals to regulate their instincts and to give adequate guidance to their emotions through deliberate experience. We must aim to secure and present opportunities for developing right habits and for bringing about an effective motivation so that right habits may be desired and cultivated.

Intelligence really gets its best chance to function and control action when our instincts, feelings, and habits are inadequate to meet situations. "The intellectual factor fixes and rallies maturing attitudes and systems," as Jastrow states, and brings about "the moral regulation of trends and desires."

I think that a high degree of character-development does not come through a direct appeal to the intelligence, but results from what Dr. Cabot terms, entering the mind by the back door, that is, by suggestion. The suggestion that goes to formulate character is often far more efficient than the direct intellectual appeal. "Our ideas and our beliefs, our ethics and religion, our arts, science and politics *are* through suggestibility," writes Professor Martin.

And further, "Child morality and adult morality too, for that matter, is much more a matter of suggestion than of a reasoned conduct." If he is correct, possibly one can understand the Englishman's explanation of why America, after applauding Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points, rejected the treaty he helped consummate. It illustrates how, with all our high ideals, we often fail to act quite in accord with them. Said he, "An experience of mine makes it quite clear. I was motoring along a road near Chicago, and suddenly I saw a sign painted on a huge rock admonishing us: 'Prepare to meet thy God.' I thought it was a very noble spiritual appeal. While reflecting upon its message I was stunned to note, only a bit farther along the road another and an equally large sign, bidding us 'Detour.' Much of our travel along the road of character training is met by detours."

Intelligence can function, and it does function, but it functions best in establishing our ideals and in formulating our abstract principles. It is not, however, the fundamental, basic factor in character-formation. Ellwood maintains: "Intelligence in a form of social imagination must lead the way." Thus we can foster the development of such intellectual approaches as may be of greater avail to us in molding, stimulating, or inhibiting character as occasion demands. Our ideals are intellectual ends toward which social practice must tend and they must lead the way. The fundamentals of character are truth and justice and a sense of their value and relationship in man's dealings with man. They require organization into the organic being of the present and future generation. And this is no light task.

After all, character still harks back to ancient directions and goals. The essence of character that we are seeking today, whether we attempt to secure it through intellectual activity or indirect suggestion, is found in the words of the prophet Micah, "To do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." To this we need but add the wealth of the Golden Rule.: "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you."

THE CHILD, THE HOME, AND THE SCHOOL

THE PRESCHOOL CHILD AND THE PRESENT-DAY PARENT

Dr. Arnold Gesell, Director, Yale Psycho-Clinic, Yale University

The child of preschool age is being rediscovered. He has existed as long as the race has existed; but his great importance in the scheme of things is rising into bold and arresting prominence. He has become in his way a social problem. It is as though he had suddenly acquired some magnetic power which compels us to look in his direction.

He is the focus of attention from many quarters. He has a new status in social planning, in public health, even in science. He has recently been the subject of long debate in the British Parliament, and he is, of course, responsible for this Mid-West Conference on Parent Education.

The total size of the preschool population of the United State is large enough. There are some thirteen millions of children who have not yet cut their sixth-year molars. This number is not much less than the entire enrollment of the elementary schools of the country.

THE SOCIAL IMPORTANCE OF THE PRESCHOOL AGE

We are scarcely aware of the great size of this preschool army because the army is a very scattered one, and it never assembles to make a show of its numerical strength. These preschool children are now in cradles and perambulators, or they are making brave excursions on their runabout kiddy-kars, in the nursery, in the back yard, or on the front sidewalk. One in nine of eligible age

may attend a kindergarten. A small fraction come under the auspices of infant welfare or a health center. It is when a fairly large group are assembled at some busy consultation center that we are most conscious of the social importance of the infant.

In a few years all the survivors of this large army will by virtue of legal age come within the scope of compulsory public education; but while they are of preschool age, children come only partially and sketchily within the sphere of social control. The social status of the preschool child of today is somewhat like that of the school child of a century ago, before the time of public education, medical school inspection and protective legislation. The mental and physical welfare of the preschool children of today is quite at the mercy of the multitude of individual homes in which these children are distributed. The developmental opportunities of the preschool child hinge on the fathers and mothers who make or mar these homes. His fortunes depend on his parents.

The rediscovery of the preschool child, therefore, has resulted in the discovery of his parents. We may say that the parent, too, has become something of a social problem. Indeed, we are beginning to reformulate the problem of the hygiene of the preschool child in terms of parent education and parent guidance. Although the development of the preschool child must be brought more systematically under the control of society, that control should be achieved indirectly through his parents. Indeed, in a certain sense the preschool child, as such, scarcely exists. His mental life and physical growth are so profoundly dependent upon the parents who gave him the first impulse to life and growth that it is almost impossible to study his nature and

needs except in terms of the parent-child relation. Our plans and our dreams with respect to the preschool child of today and tomorrow must reckon at every turn with the parent. There will be no sociological short cut. We cannot congregate the embryo members of the body politic into state nurseries. We can deal with infancy only through individuals and through individual homes.

The problem of parent education is a concrete problem which can be approached through social methods with which we are already somewhat familiar. There is little danger that a social interest in this whole problem will diminish either parental interest or parental responsibility. In fact, the whole tide of the present movement is in the contrary direction. The new premium which is placed upon the importance of the preschool years of childhood has already heightened the importance of the task of parenthood.

Here a word may be said about the present-day status of family life in America. There are many distressing and disquieting signs of instability. The shocking rise in marital divorce cannot, however, be construed as a decline of interest in young children. It means too many other things. Even the declining birth-rate has a compensation in the higher premium it places on every surviving newborn infant. The birth-rate in superior family strains is falling too low, but infant life is really not held as cheap as in the earlier days of excessive infant and maternal death-rates.

The youth and the young married couples of today are perhaps even a little more cognizant of the meaning of parenthood than were any preceding generation. There is no evidence whatever that child life is falling into lower

esteem. In fact, the evidence is just the other way. We hear too little of the unnumbered unheralded homes, where wholesome young people are eagerly seeking every possible guide to help them rear their young child aright. They are ready for more guidance than society is prepared to give. The present-day movement in behalf of the preschool child, as a popular movement, is both a symptom and a cause. Through it the young parents of the country are becoming articulate. This movement will doubtless grow and ramify until parent, child, and community will come into multiplying relations which will make the home of the future richer and stronger than it ever was in the past. By a better home, I mean one in which the preschool child will have a greater opportunity to attain full stature of mind and body.

What are the chances for such full stature today? They are not the best. One-third of all the deaths of the nation occur below the age of six years. There are ten times as many deaths during the half-decade of preschool life as during the following decades of school life. Most of the common physical defects of school children like malnutrition and nose and throat defects are more prevalent among preschool children than among school children. Rickets, a disorder of nutrition, is almost as common as dental caries and is essentially a preschool disease.

Practically every case of mental deficiency dates back to birth or early childhood. Three-fourths of all the deaf, a considerable portion of all the blind, one-third of all the crippled, and over three-fourths of all the speech defectives come to their handicap during their preschool period. Many conduct disorders and defects of behavior take shape in this same period.

INFANCY AND PREVENTIVE MENTAL HYGIENE

All told the preschool age is the most fundamental, the most formative, the most precarious portion of the whole life-cycle. If we wish to increase the physical stamina of the nation, we must begin at the bottom, safeguard the physical growth of the child from infancy, and make the health protection of the preschool child as universal as public elementary education. If we wish to increase the mental stamina of the nation and cut down the stupendous load of insanity, crime, nervous and mental defect, we must strike near the root and institute preventive measures of mental hygiene in the earliest years of life.

The necessity of a far-reaching and basic program of mental hygiene is increasingly apparent. The expense of caring for the mentally disordered, the mentally incompetent, the delinquent, and the dependent is becoming the greatest single item on the budget of each state. There are more beds for nervous and mental illness in the United States than all the ordinary hospital beds of the country put together. Every seventh person in New York state dies in a hospital for the insane. About a half-million delinquents annually pass through our courts and penitentiaries. The reduction at the root of at least the preventable portion of all this tragic wastage of humanity is so important that we must begin to think of the task in terms of childhood and even of infancy.

Civilization will bend under its own weight unless it finds means of strengthening the psychological stamina of succeeding generations. Science is beginning to feel the spur of this danger. Science created the mechanical features of our civilization. Science now has a new task:

to investigate the human mind which is creator and carrier of this complicated culture. In the language of B.L.T., who and what is this so-called human being?

Biology is studying the racial origins and basic mechanisms of this human being. Anthropology is studying the meaning of his multiform manners and customs. Psychiatry is studying his aberrations, his frailities, his tragic and near tragic failures to adjust to his fellow-men. Psychology is studying the characteristic and conditions of his normal development from infancy to maturity.

This is a new kind of science which is taking shape; it is nothing less than a conscious effort on the part of the race to understand itself. We cannot leave the mysteries of the human mind to the speculations of the philosopher. We shall always need philosophy, and art, and religion; but in addition we need an understanding of the laws of human behavior. These laws will not be ascertained by self-revelation. They must be studied with the zeal of the physicist in his pursuit of the atom and electron.

The human mind is part of the order of nature. It therefore behaves according to laws. It grows not unlike a plant, subject to inherent limitations, to habitat and stimulation. In spite of individual variations, infant, youth, and adult behave according to general laws of human nature. These laws will some day be formulated with such precision that they can be used to predict and to control human nature.

THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF PARENT EDUCATION

This is the faith behind the mental hygiene movement. It is the faith behind the nation-wide movement for parent education. Every intelligent parent knows that the men-

tal growth of the young child is not blindly fore-ordained but will be responsive to the atmosphere and the procedures of the home. Public health leaders and educators alike realize that if we are to safeguard early mental growth, society must systematically institute measures of parental guidance and of preparental education.

How can this be done?

1. By incorporating courses in child development and child care into the home economics instruction of youths in high school and college. In time these courses should frankly become courses in preparental education. It is futile to side step the issues of home life and the difficulties of rearing children by maintaining a squeamish policy of silence in the public schools.

2. By developing centers of parental training, in connection with kindergartens and nursery schools. Preschool education should be cautiously extended through the kindergarten and otherwise; but not so much for its own sake as for the sake of the parents of the preschool children. The great objective should be to assist the home and the parent, not to displace them.

3. By instituting periodic developmental examinations from infancy to school entrance. These examinations can be made through an anticipatory downward extension of medical school inspection, through health centers and preschool clinics, but best of all through the upward extension of the infant consultation center.

SOCIAL MEASURES FOR DEVELOPMENTAL SUPERVISION OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Our goal should be a continuous periodic developmental supervision from the prenatal period to the pri-

mary school. Through family physician and through consultation centers this goal can be reached. The developmental supervision must be comprehensive enough to include both mind and physique. Nutrition is basic, but it is the point of departure for a periodic survey of the child's total economy, his psychological as well as physical.

Mental hygiene as a branch of social medicine will rest upon a developmental supervision of this type. Such a supervision will be sufficiently timely to nip many mental abnormalities in the bud. It will be sufficiently constructive to strengthen what is normal and sound. It will place such a premium upon mental health in both parent and child, that we may look for a great ultimate increase in the psychological stamina of the population. What medical science has accomplished in the reduction of infant mortality makes us confident in the possibilities of preventive mental hygiene.

The first infant consultation center was established in France just a generation ago. It has flourished like a mustard seed and spread the world over. It has not yet become as universal as the public elementary school, but it promises a similar destiny. The time is rapidly approaching when the developmental opportunities of preschool children will be as democratically safeguarded as those of school children. In this developmental sense, through direct assistance of the responsible parent, the preschool period is coming under social control.

Fortunately this goal can be achieved in a non-autocratic way, through co-operative and educational approaches, which will stimulate rather than weaken the responsibilities of parenthood.

On the practical side, therefore, the problem is to develop the same solicitude for mental growth which we have begun to show for physical growth. The intelligent parent of today carefully follows the physical growth curve of the young child as indicated by inches and pounds. She wants her child to make consistent gains and to reach certain standards. Although mental growth cannot be measured with the same precision, it is equally desirable that we should have behavior standards or educational standards which will serve a similar purpose and help us to keep the child up to a maximum level of mental development. No programs for developmental supervision can operate without working standards.

It is not that we wish to standardize the children, but rather that we must define methods which can be applied.

YALE STUDIES OF EARLY MENTAL GROWTH

The Yale Psycho-Clinic has for several years been interested in this problem of standards of mental growth in children of preschool age. Accordingly we have made a series of studies of some five hundred normal children at ten ascending levels of their development—at one, four, six, nine, twelve, and eighteen months and at two, three, four, and five years. Fifty children were studied at each of these levels to determine their significant characteristics with respect to motor ability, language, general intelligent behavior, and personal social behavior.

This investigation has furnished us with an outline of the progressive stages of normal mental development, and given us some preliminary conception of what a child "ought" to be at these stages.

Through a series of motion pictures[1] we have recorded certain phases of our study of preschool children, designed to show both the scientific and practical significance of the earliest stages of growth. The infant's mental growth is so swift, so elusive, and withal so familiar, that its true wonder tends to escape us. This film is probably unique in the youthfulness of the principals who enact the drama. The youngest subject is just one month of age; others are four, six, nine, twelve, eighteen months, and two, three, four, and five years of age. These children appear on the screen in the order of their ages; and thus the spectator gets a sequence of cross-sectional views, which build up a cumulative impression of the speed and richness of development in infancy.

The mind does not prove to be too intangible for representation on the screen. The psychologist through his observations and experiments studies the mental factor by recording and measuring the objective behavior. This motion picture is a record of the behavior of normal children in various situations which portray their psychological maturity and capacity. Nearly all the pictures are close-ups and reveal the details of the child's characteristic reactions to the psychological test situations which are used to measure his development.

The one-month-old babe blinks but cannot even hold up his head; the four-months old babe gazes at a one-inch

[1] A motion picture dealing with the mental growth of the preschool child was shown at the Mid-West Conference meeting. This picture was made at Yale University with the co-operation of the Pathé Exchange. The subject matter of the picture is briefly described (see also Vol. 121, No. 210, of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Philadelphia, 1925).

cubical block placed before him but fails to pick it up; the six-month-old infant seizes the block with executive directness and puts it to the mouth; the nine-month infant bangs it against a cup in combining play; the year-old subject unwraps it from a paper covering; the eighteen-months youngster stands on his own feet and builds a tall tower of blocks; the two-year-old assembles a pile of blocks with deftness; the three-year-old builds a bridge of them; the four-year-old, a more difficult gate; and the five-year-old caps the climax by reproducing from memory a complicated stairway model presented by the examiner. And so the reactions to the building blocks furnish a cinema summary of the child's mental growth. These reactions and many others have been studied in several hundreds of children at the Yale Psycho-Clinic and have been standardized into behavior norms for developmental diagnosis.

The cinema shows the subjects responding to various psychological tests. A vigorous nine-month-old baby spends a tantalizing minute on the screen in a persistent and finally successful attempt to pick up a pellet with a fine pincer-like prehension. A year-old-boy places a block in a form board. A four-year-old captures a psychological fish in a motor co-ordination test.

One of the chapters in the film is entitled, "The Evolution of Man." This is a graded series of children's drawings, which are projected on the screen in dissolving sequence and show the ascent of man from a primitive scribble to a boldly executed kindergarten creation of the human form.

The motion pictures were made in the psycho-clinical laboratory. The mothers co-operated at every turn, and it

was found that the children were neither frightened nor distracted by the grinding camera. The youngest infants were blissfully unaware, and the older ones were too interested in the psychological test situations to do anything but attend to the task in hand.

Although these reels were the outgrowth of a scientific research, the scenario includes glimpses of the practical work of a psychological clinic and of a baby welfare station, and indicate the importance of keeping the total development of young children under systematic supervision.

The cinema cannot, of course, make the psychic essence of the mind visible on the screen. It serves, however, to sharpen our perception for the psychology of infancy, and to inform our faith in the dynamic importance of early growth and education.

A concluding section of the picture suggests the strategic social position of the public school in the hygiene of the preschool child and the education of parents. The lively front entrance of a public school building on an infant welfare conference afternoon is pictured. The conference for well babies is going on in the basement of the building. A dozen baby carriages, with mothers and the public health nurse are visible. Perhaps there is a grandmother in the group. On the margins are interested kindergarten and primary-school children. Within the building is a class of white-capped grammar school girls at the cooking ranges of the home economics course. Here we have in juxtaposition various levels of two or three generations. Here we glimpse the meaning of the infant as the potential school beginner, of the adolescent as a potential parent, of the adult who must share with the public school the task of early education.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PARENT AND TEACHER ON THE INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

Walter F. Dearborn, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

With the advent of intelligence tests and their increasing use in the schools, there has also been promulgated a notion, unfortunate in its consequences, of a fixed intellectual endowment, with which a child is born, which neither he nor his parent can by taking thought alter, and which the intelligence tests are chiefly designed to measure. I wish to make clear that, on the contrary, what the intelligence tests measure is definitely effected for better or worse, that it is increased or decreased, by what the home and the school, or the parent and the teacher, do for their children and pupils.

The cultural anthropologist and psychologist, as contrasted with those who believe in the prepondering influence of that which is instinctive, inborn, or inherited in shaping the destinies of man, are insisting with renewed vigor on this recent emergence of the old problem of nature versus nurture, that the intelligence tester is overstating nature's case. Professor Boaz has recently pointed out that although there are evidently marked anatomical differences between men, different individuals may become adjusted to the same demands.

The healthy individual without harm to his body may at one time be a vegeterian and at another time may live

on an exclusive meat diet. He may live a lazy life at the level of the sea, or subject himself to strenuous exercise in high altitudes. There are limits to adaptability that depend on the soundness of the organism, but within wide limits of external conditions an optimum of efficiency may be maintained.

There is a "margin of safety which exists for all organisms." So, given the environmental demand or, as the psychologists like to say, "stimulus," the same individual, the same family strain, and the same race may show a wide range of intellectual functioning. With such considerations in mind, we may well be cautious in prophesying the limits of individual, family, or race achievement. Yet this is in fact what the intelligence tester has been attempting to do.

Psychologists have at times in their discussions all but assumed, and the pseudo-psychologists have assumed, that the individual's limitations were due solely to intellectual endowment which he inherits, and that the intelligence test measures solely this hereditary endowment or native intelligence. But no one has succeeded in separating these factors, and the intelligence test measures the composite result. Some of these factors may be under control in a given case and others may not. Even such a conservative statement as the following from a recent book errs in regarding endowment as the one factor isolated by the tests.

Much of the opposition to psychological tests is founded upon an emotional reaction against the idea that human limitations can be declared. Once this possibility is admitted, everyone feels that his privacy is invaded. Each one makes a personal application and is alarmed at the thought that his secret inferiorities may now be

published to the world. Evidence of this is the stereotyped retort: "I'm sure I couldn't pass the eight-year-old test myself; I should turn out to be an imbecile." Growing out of this personal reaction is the more altruistic but no less violent revolt against the mere suggestion that every human being does not hold infinite possibilities. We like to believe that every child, given a proper environment, may turn out to be a genius.

Yet when we face the problem with scientific candor, we are obliged to admit that only two alternatives exist. Either everybody is born with the same intellectual potentialities or not. Either everybody is equally endowed or differently endowed. Those of us who believe in psychological tests feel that, however crude and inadequate our present methods may be we have at least at our command a means of discovering the grosser differences in intellectual endowment in early childhood.[1]

But the shoe fits quite as well on the other foot and we may then say that what the intelligence test does is to anticipate or foresee what the school and society is going to do to the individual in the course of time. So long as the school and society remain as they are, this prevision is possible in a great many cases and is very useful. Teachers' judgments, marks, and examination grades also share in this distinction and service. The tests and teachers predict what the individual is likely to learn from what he has already learned. In how far the previous learning, which is the basis of prediction, is due to faulty and limiting habit and in how far to limited endowment is a matter of conjecture. Here no more than elsewhere can we separate nature from nurture; intellect

[1] Quoted from Irwin and Marks: "Fitting the School to the Child."

from culture; neither the body nor the mind develops *in vacuo.*

What schooling and a cultured home can do by way of improving the intelligence, as tested, is best illustrated by the contrast presented by the lack of these influences. Particularly impressive in this respect is Gordon's study of the English canal boat children. These children receive little or no schooling, their average attendance at school being estimated at only 4 or 5 per cent of the school year, and their social contacts and intellectual life, as judged by ordinary standards, are most limited. Their parents are for the most part illiterate. On the other hand, "In respect to health, cleanliness, morality, feeding, etc., they are fully equal if not superior, to town dwellers of a similar character." That these children are not mentally defective, in the ordinary sense of the term, is amply shown by various observations and by the life and wages of their parents.

Gordon found that canal boat children of six years of age were, by test, of normal intelligence, their I.Q.'s ranging from 90 to 100, whereas the seven-year-olds had I.Q.'s averaging between 80 and 90, the eight-year-olds between 70 and 80, and the children of nine years of age, with one exception, had I.Q.'s below 70. In other words, if judged by the result of the test alone, the nine-year-olds would be rated as feeble-minded.

There seems but one possible explanation of these findings: The reason the younger children do better in the Binet tests is that success, in the tests for the very early years, does not depend upon schooling and but little on the ordinary cultural environment, and the failure of the older children is largely due to the fact that the tests

for the higher ages do require some schooling and some culture. Another factor which makes for differences in the intellectual status of children at any given time is the differing rates of maturing. This is also a factor which is affected by environmental influences, and not solely a matter of innate determination.

Severe illness and social isolation may sometimes account for retarded development; a process of "hot housing" which is sometimes resorted to by overambitious parents may produce at least temporary acceleration in development. In others the cause appears to be inherent. As Cyril Burt has said in speaking of children whose growth has been retarded:

Such children are creatures of deferred maturity. Their development is not arrested; it has been postponed. Although on a lower plane, their mental phenomenon is more familiar. There is many a sharp child whose cycle of growth is like that of the mulberry tree, presenting first a long delay, and then a sudden yield of flower and fruit together. Their existence is recognized in the double scholarship examination. In London at the age of thirteen a second examination has been instituted specifically for those who in the current phrase "bloom late," and whose anticipated powers, therefore, do not ripen by the age of ten. In like fashion, among classes of defectives, time and due season will here and there disclose a sporadic "school autumnal!"

On the other hand, some of our much heralded prodigies, who have rather petered out in later years, may prove to have maintained their relative superiority for a few years because of early maturing, supplemented by a kind of hot-housing. What some parents attempt to do and occasionally succeed in doing for a time with the common

garden variety of intellect gives pause to the enthusiasm of the most ardent cultural anthropologist or psychologist. Such parents, it must be said, frequently pass the bounds or "margins of safety" which nature has set for its children. When one meets these overambitious parents and their rank and weedy offspring, he is inclined to write a chapter on "What Children Ought to Know about the Intelligence of Their Parents."

A third source or cause of error in judging intelligence is the failure to recognize that there are different kinds of intelligence and that the schools prefer almost exclusively one kind of intelligence to the detriment of those who do not possess it, or have not cultivated it. I wish to review with you a few indications of the preponderance in present-day schooling of verbal or linguistic knowledge and the resulting handicaps to which those who are not possessed of this knowledge are subject, and then to show the falsity of the estimates or the so-called measurements of the intelligence of those thus handicapped, in a word, of those who have, in the first instance, either not learned to read or read poorly.

Ability to read and write is generally regarded so all pervasive in its effects that among the dictionary synonyms of "illiterate" we find "unlearned" or "uneducated" and "untaught." A bright child who has not learned to read may if he is a good listener get along fairly well in the early years of school, and may do correspondingly well in the tests of intelligence, but, with advance in grade, instruction is decreasingly less by word of mouth and increasingly by books so that the progress of the nonreader is pretty effectively blocked by the fourth grade of school, and his intelligence quotient, according to the cur-

rently used tests decreases in proportion with his advancing years. If, at school entrance, his intelligence quotient was found to be even well over 100, it may now have dwindled to 70 and he himself have become (in the eyes of his teachers and of psychologists) a candidate not only for the special class, but in some instances, such as have come to my attention for a school for the feeble-minded.

The other day I set some problems in arithmetic for a fourteen-year-old girl. She read the simplest problems haltingly. In one she met the word "rectangle" and asked what the word meant. As I began to reply she anticipated my explanation, and explained, "Oh, yes, you mean a right-tangle" at the same time outlining with her hand the form of a triangle. As I replied, "No, I don't mean a triangle," she burst into laughter at her own confusion, and when I in turn outlined with my hands the shape of a rectangle she promptly solved the problem. The next problem began, "To a savings amounting to $2.50." This phrase needed to be paraphrased before a start could be made toward the solution of the problem. This girl had just secured on a Binet Intelligence Test a score equal to that of her age, to be exact, an I.Q. of 98. She had passed practical tests of the sixteenth and eighteenth-year level, and to my mind was, except for her special disability, well above the average of her age in intelligence; yet, although she had had eight years of schooling, the last six of which had been spent at an excellent private school, she was unable to read as well as the average of third-grade readers, and her spelling would easily take place among the wonders of the world.

If such were the difficulties of arithmetic, what chance has such a pupil in the study even of science to say

nothing of history and geography, literature, and of modern and ancient languages. The doors of further academic training are closed until such time as she has learned to read.

This example you may feel is an extreme and a rare one. But, in my opinion, there are a great many children, what proportion we can only surmise, whose course through school is definitely curtailed because of lesser degrees of the same handicap. They may have overcome the handicap at an earlier age, but not outgrown it sufficiently but that its influence may be observed in all their subsequent studies. The relative success of students in college may be due in part to this factor. I am inclined to this explanation to account for the results of a recent study of the marks of certain groups of college students. In this study the marks in Harvard College of men who subsequently became college professors were compared with the marks of men who subsequently became eminent in business. Ninety-two per cent of the marks received, when undergraduates, by men who subsequently became college professors were better than the average or "C" grade, whereas but 50 per cent of the grades of the business men were better than average. There were also noticeable differences between professors. Students who later became professors of physics and chemistry received only half as many of the highest or "A" grades as did those who subsequently became professors of Latin and Greek and of the modern languages. Another group may be mentioned who later became politicians, the Senators and Congressmen. They, as the business men—there were of course exceptions to the rule—were about average in their college standing.

We wish now simply to point out that the makers of the intelligence tests are faced with the same problem. The psychologist who writes "if intelligence is the ability to think in terms of abstract ideas, we should expect the most successful intelligence tests to be just those which involve the use of language and other symbols" would evidently not hesitate to award the laurel, as does the college, to the professors of Latin and Greek and those of the modern languages. He who holds that there are three different kinds of intelligence, the abstract, the concrete, and the social would explain on this hypothesis very patly the academic reports of the business man and of the politician.

The professors of language stand at the peak of eminence in the literary-academic intelligence which our present intelligence tests chiefly measure. Business men, it need hardly be said, are not altogether lacking in this type of intelligence, nor are the professors altogether without other kinds of intelligence. There are no such clean-cut demarcations, and of course, other factors complicate the analysis; but a difference in intelligence is one factor which enters into the explanation of these findings. The college may or may not be well advised in preferring one type of intellect, but tests which purport so to sample the different specializations of the mind that comparisons may be made of individual differences in intellectual power cannot, in all fairness, be thus partial.

The foregoing considerations may suffice to show why the person who is suffering from special disability in reading will be at an extraordinarily great disadvantage in school and likely to be sadly misjudged by the intelligence tester. What is true for the *non*-readers, so-called,

applies in lesser degrees to the *poor* readers. Before turning to a description of specific cases, it may be well first to consider briefly some findings in regard to the nature of their special difficulties. I have recently described these at greater length in connection with clinical studies of two of my students in a monograph on *Special Disabilities in Learning to Read and Write,* and will now only refer to one or two characteristic features.

The extreme cases are examples of what have hitherto been described as congenital word blindness. It has long been held that this condition is due to deficiencies in certain so-called word-association areas of the cerebral cortex. We now feel quite certain that this is not the case, and that the disability is due to the presence of deviations altogether normal in themselves which, however, conspire under the usual requirements of the pedagogy of reading and writing to produce what are essentially simply faulty habits. We have found for one thing that an unusual proportion of these cases are left-handed and inclined, when they were first taught to write, to produce reversed or mirror writing.

How differences in handedness may possibly operate to cause difficulties in reading will appear from the following statement. If a left-handed boy gets the "feel" of the movement made by his right-handed teacher in writing the word "cat," and starting (as she does) from the center of the body moves his left hand outward, he will be told that he must not move his hand from the right toward the left, but from the left toward the right, and that he must watch the teacher and do as she does. He is thus required at the start to disregard his kinaesthetic stimuli and imagery, or at least to subordinate them to the visual.

If the kinaesthetic feelings and memories of movement happen to be his forte (as compared with the visual), he may be doubly injured in the great process of conformity which education is. Instead of the integration of kinaesthetic and visual memories which is taking place in his right-handed classmates, he begins with something of a conflict, because, while he may learn to conform in the matter of handwriting, he will follow his inclinations in other activities. The little girl who conforms to requirements in writing and in many other activities may slyly, when not under the watchful eye of parent or teacher, shift the needle into her left hand for sewing. When a left-handed boy draws a train of cars or a donkey going into a barn no one objects to his engine or his donkey facing toward his right. He will naturally draw them this way, if, as is natural, he starts with the donkey's head and finishes with its tail, because his hand will thus not obstruct his view during the operation. The right-handed boy or girl will usually face these objects toward his or her left hand for the same reasons. But when the left-handed boy begins to write he must "push" his hand in a direction which covers what he has written, or adopt a position for holding his pencil which is not the correct one, and which seems and is, indeed, awkward both from his standpoint and that of the observer. This may not appear a very serious matter but it is of the nature of an initial handicap.

The initial situation of the non-reader is similar. In the cases studied by the speaker, now about twenty-five in number, at least a third have been left-handed. This is, of course, a somewhat larger proportion than would be expected in a group of otherwise normal or superior chil-

dren such as all of these cases are. The way in which left-handedness may possibly operate as an initial handicap in reading, just as it has been shown to be in writing, is suggested by the following observations. The outgoing movement of the left hand is from the center of the body toward the left. The left-handed person, possibly because he watches what his preferred hand does and thus establishes the habit, may show a preference for this same direction in his eye movements. The reading of "saw" as "was" is a very commonly observed error, although it is not confined to the left-handed. In tachistoscopic experiments there is a tendency for the left-handed to catch the end letters of words first, just as the right-handed commonly get the initial letters first. The reading of "when" as "now" would seem quite unintelligible except as one had observed this tendency. A mirror writer showed in the Binet test the curious tendency to invert certain series as for example, Friday comes after Saturday. In the reading test he persisted in placing the required lines over the drawing even when it was pointed out to him that the directions called for the line to be drawn under the figure. The confusion of letters which are the same in form but different in position, such as *p, g; d, b; n, w,* has been explained as due to the fact that our earliest memories of letters may be muscular. The eye-movements may be quite as important as hand movements in fixing these memories.

This description gives but a sample of various motor and perceptual difficulties which an analysis of these cases of non-readers has brought to light. For the purposes of the present discussion they need not be further reviewed. It is sufficient to note that when these difficulties become

accumulative in a given individual pupil and especially when they are associated with or complicated by faults of early home training which make him in other respects a "difficult" pupil we have in the process of formation cases such as the physicians have described as congenital word-blindness and sometimes have mistaken for cases of feeble-mindedness. Except, however, for such small initial difficulties, there is, in my experience, nothing congenital, and no "blindness" except on the part of the parents and teachers who have thus signally failed in the child's up-bringing and education.

We have given some concrete examples of the effects of the cultural influences of the home and the school, or of their lack, on the intellectual development of children. I trust that these suggestions may lead some of you to think better of your opportunities as parents and teachers and not leave to nature alone, whether it seems to have been generous or niggardly, either your own intelligence or the intelligences of your children and pupils.

DIRECT INSTRUCTION IN MORAL AND CIVIC EDUCATION

Ernest Horn, Director, College of Education,
State University of Iowa

No one can read the books and magazines which have been published during the past year without being impressed with the strong and universal interest in moral and civic education.

The most disheartening feature of this widespread interest in moral education and in education for citizenship is the fact that so large a number of speakers believe that they already have the answer, when those who are most carefully studying the problem know that no one has the solution at the present time.

Since the greatest minds that the world has ever known have worked with this problem philosophically and since a catalogue of the judgments of these people gives a long list of divergent recommendations as to how to develop good conduct in people, it stands to reason that we have accomplished all that is possible until we get more facts.

Mere philosophizing, in my judgment, will not bring any further improvement except as it is done in the light of new data, which are not now in existence. I say this because I am quite sure that with this tremendous interest in moral education, manifested in every part of the United States, we are sure to have books, magazine articles, and speeches in which are presented immature and unreliable recommendations as to how young children are to be developed into moral and law-abiding citizens.

This problem of moral education is not new. Parents and teachers in every age have been confronted with it. It is particularly critical, whenever conditions change so rapidly that the old traditions, upon which all of us rely in large part, break down. At such times the individual is confronted with a variety of choices, and must rely, not upon his taste and feeling, which are influenced by tradition, but upon his intellect. I have great confidence in my personal friends, but there is not one of them that I would trust to behave himself for one day if you would take away from him the traditions, the tastes, and the feelings which have always been the backbone of conduct.

Perhaps no period in the past has seen such rapid changes as our own and perhaps no period has seen such a break down of traditions. As a consequence of this, it is quite clear that all of our educational institutions—the church, the home, the school, and the press—have a difficult job cut out for them in building a new consensus of taste, feeling, and judgment about right conduct. We must develop traditional ways of feeling and acting which fit the needs of modern life.

The problem at the present time is made exceedingly serious because of the fact that among the younger generation or at least among certain groups of young people there is a consensus of opinion as to how young people should act which does not agree with the consensus to which many of us hold as to their proper conduct. This divergence of taste and judgment creates a very serious situation. We must face the fact that when groups of young people have a consensus of taste and opinion which is unsocial and morally destructive to themselves as well as to others, little can be done to improve the conduct of

individuals in the group until this consensus is changed. To lead young people to make this change is a ticklish task.

Our difficulty at the present time is made greater by the fact that there is prevalent a particularly pernicious philosophy of life. This philosophy of life emphasizes self-expression to the neglect of service. It emphasizes freedom to the neglect of responsibility. In its worst form it advocates the pursuit of immediate interests, often of a sensational kind, without any regard for the rights of others, or for one's own future happiness.

The extreme form of a philosophy of education which is held in some quarters teaches that the purpose of education is to cater to the transient interests and purposes of children. It is easy to see that unless those purposes are defined in terms of the social good, as well as in terms of the individual's own future good, such a type of schooling plays all too well into the hands of this unsatisfactory philosophy of life.

What we need is not more initiative or self-expression of a nondescript kind, what we want are initiatives and modes of self-expression of a desirable kind. What we want is not a purpose without regard to its social value, what we want are certain purposes of definite value in life. Certainly no philosophy of education which divorces freedom, purpose, and self-expression from responsibility and service can be accepted as a guide in making good citizens.

Few realize how difficult the position is in which modern teachers are placed. Even when we agree that men and women should act in a certain way, it is not easy to teach young people to act in that way. But when the com-

munity cannot agree as to how men and women should act in a given situation, you can readily see that the teacher's task in developing right conduct in that situation is particularly difficult. There are those who say that, under the circumstances, all that can be done is to teach the pupil to think for himself, and to take an open-minded attitude even toward types of conduct that many now think to be immoral. I believe that I can show that such a belief is absurd, and that the school must directly prepare the child to be sensitive to right and wrong in moral and civic situations and must teach him how to act in the most important of the situations. To do this, however, it is necessary to get the best possible consensus as to what desirable conduct is in typical and important situations in life. Accordingly, the first job in moral and civic education is to make a careful analysis of present moral and civic situations in order to build out of that consensus the course of study which is to be the teacher's guide. I shall mention but two of the procedures which have been followed in the attempt to make such a course of study.

First, one hundred judges, I mean by that one hundred high-grade citizens, were asked two questions. The first question was this: Think of the individual who in your judgment would be the greatest loss if removed from your community. Now think of situations in which you have known that individual to be, and tell concretely and specifically what that individual did in those situations to make him a desirable member of the community. The purpose of this investigation is to get a large and complete list of the important moral and civic situations in life and to determine what our best citizens, men and women, do in those situations.

The second question was: Think now of the individual that your community would be best rid of. Think of specific situations in which you know that individual to have been. What did the individual do in those situations that made him so objectionable to your community?

From the answers to these questions it is possible to get a fair catalogue of the typical moral situations in a community and also a fair catalogue, appraised by competent people, of desirable and undesirable modes of conduct in those situations.

So much for the first method of attack. We have only started upon this, and we will have to depend no doubt upon groups such as this to carry on this very careful, concrete type of invoice of social situations and trait actions in those situations.

The results of a second investigation have been used as a check on the data obtained from the answers to these two questions. It seemed to the speaker that the race must have learned something about what is good to do, and that if we could find the deposit of this racial wisdom, we should find by an analysis of that deposit at least a hint as to how people should act in important types of situations. It seemed to the speaker that the richest deposit of data on moral conduct would probably be found in our laws. It is clear that wherever two individuals disagree as to what is right to do, or where there is conflict between an individual and a community, or where there is disagreement between communities, such disagreement, if serious, is likely to come before the court, and if often repeated, to become the subject of a law.

In all of these hundreds of years the race has experimented to find the best rules of living. To the critical

formulation and interpretation of these rules have been devoted some of the keenest minds and finest characters that the world has ever known. The result is our present body of law. I believe that any citizen of a middle western state who will read the code for his state will see that that code tends to approach the most ethical statement which can be practically administered before the court. A catalogue, then, of the actual cases in law with the frequencies with which they occur and the penalties attached to them seems to give us a very valuable prospectus of all of the civic and moral situations which are serious enough to get before the court.

These are but two of many procedures by which students of this problem are attempting to decide what should be taught to the next generation.

Coming back now to an inspection of our time, with its divergent points of view and its rapidly changing economic and social conditions, it is easy to see that many individuals have not adjusted themselves satisfactorily to these changes. This failure is shown in a striking way by our crime statistics. The seriousness of the situation in this country can be shown by comparing our crime statistics with those of certain other parts of the world. It is disturbing to know that one is forty times as likely to be murdered in this country as he would be if he lived in Switzerland, and when one objects that we cannot compare European conditions with those in America, it is still disturbing to know that one is sixteen times as likely to be murdered in this country as he would be if he lived in Ontario or Quebec. These differences are too large to be casually put aside, and similar differences can be shown in the statistics for other types of crime.

Clearly, we have before us a problem that merits the most serious consideration on the part of every one of our fundamental institutions. Can this problem be attacked directly? In the past and indeed even in the present, many have felt that direct instruction in moral and civic education cannot be given. It has been said that matters of morals are so subtle that they cannot be handled directly. It is maintained by those who have held that point of view that we must get our moral education indirectly as a by-product from the playground, from the teaching of literature, and from the teaching of history.

Twenty years ago many schools started a program of teaching spelling, and arithmetic and reading incidentally. There were no separate periods in these schools for teaching these subjects, but a careful and scientific measure of the results has shown that that plan is not efficient. The most careful investigators have concluded that it is best to leave the unimportant things to incidental teaching, but to put the important things in the forefront, and so that they occupy the focus of attention, not only on the part of teachers but also on the part of pupils and parents.

Direct instruction then in moral and civic education seems to be demanded. Certainly no one can doubt the importance of such instruction. I have two boys. It does not worry me very much when I find that they missed one or two addition problems in their last test, or that they misspelled a few words, or that a recitation in geography was not all it ought to have been, but if they come home with the slightest indication of any moral deficiency, I must confess that I am worried. I feel sure that a similar distinction in value is in the mind of every parent in this audience. The big things, the things that count most, the

things in which we must put our hearts, our imagination, and our efforts, fall in the field of moral and civic education.

I believe that those who say that morals are too subtle or too indefinite to be taught directly or that the pupils cannot understand such things either have not tried to teach children by direct methods, or have not gone about the job frankly and with sympathy.

Let me give an illustration of direct teaching: In a certain city of about 40,000, the children in going to school cut across lots. Lawns were damaged, shrubbery broken down, and flower beds ruined. The first-grade teacher in this school saw in this situation a need for moral instruction. She went about the job frankly and directly. She could have lectured her pupils on that point and laid down rules, but having been trained to give a different type of moral instruction she did not do that. Rather, she took her pupils out to see some of these lots with the damaged lawns, shrubbery, and flower beds. She asked them if they saw anything there that they would not like if they owned the property.

She asked the pupils how they thought the householders felt about the damage. The children saw very readily that the householders, of course, would not like to see their property harmed in any way.

She might have stopped at that point by saying, "Let's not do that any more." Instead, she asked, "How can we be sure that we stop cutting across these lots?"

The pupils discussed a plan for stopping this trespass and they did stop it. They soon observed, however, that the pupils of the other grades were cutting across the lawns. They asked whether they ought not to try to

get the rest of the pupils to stop damaging these properties. Again they formulated their plan of action. They went to the householders apologizing to them, explaining that they really had not meant to do any damage. They asked the owners' permission to put up signs opposite the places where most of the damage had been done. The pupils made these signs themselves and put them up. Then they planned short speeches and chose representatives to go to the other grades in the school to make an appeal to them to stop cutting across lots.

They also posted little girls and boys opposite these corners near the school to remind boys and girls that they should not cut across the lots.

Now the teacher could have let the matter stop there. She had obtained results in terms of conduct. Instead she led her pupils to apply what they had learned to other situations. She asked them if they could think of other instances where they had, without thinking, damaged the property of others. Two children suggested that they remembered sliding down a neighbor's hay stack; others that they had been playing in an empty building without the permission of the owner; and so on, until the blackboard was full of a variety of cases of trespass.

Then, working sympathetically, she led the children to state the general principles that they should keep in mind in all these situations. Each child who had been trespassing was led to plan how not to trespass in the future.

I would like to have you notice certain things in this teaching. First, it started with a concrete situation that could be readily understood by the children. Second, the pupils themselves were allowed to sense what was wrong

in that situation. Third, the pupils were allowed to formulate for themselves a plan for right conduct. Fourth, they were allowed to carry it out, and they were left with the feeling that they had not done their job until it was carried out. Mere talking is not enough. Fifth, they were encouraged to plan for transferring what they had learned in this situation to other situations of a similar type and class; and last, they were guided in formulating in their own words and for themselves principles of conduct to govern them in the future.

You will notice that pupil initiative and proper self-expression were emphasized in all that this teacher did. Her teaching illustrates how one can combine all of the good that is claimed for freedom on the part of children with a definite sense of responsibility on their part. Here you have all of the benefits claimed by the disciplinarians coupled with the best that is claimed by those who emphasize freedom and self-expression.

Direct instruction, of the type just described, is now to be found in a great number of public schools. I have asked all of the teachers associated with me to be very critical about results. I have asked them several questions: First, is this less concrete and understandable than other subjects? Without exception they say, "No, it is more concrete." The child can understand not only exactly what it is that he is supposed to be working out but also why he is supposed to be working it out. Second, I have asked these teachers to tell whether or not this is less interesting than other subjects in the school. They say that it is more interesting. Third, I have asked them to judge critically whether it is not more important for the com-

munity and for the children than other studies in the school. The answer is that it is more important. Fourth, I have asked them to tell whether it has as unmistakable an effect upon the conduct of pupils right now as well as a promise of affecting the future as to other studies. They say, "More so."

In other words, in our two years of preliminary experimentation of concrete, direct moral instruction, we have at the present time, I believe, uniform enthusiasm on the part of teachers and of parents who have participated in this type of work.

Now I should like very much to guard against misunderstanding. This work is as yet only in its beginning. However, for the first time in twenty years of attempted study of the problem of citizenship and the problems of moral education, I have seen definite, tangible results of a positive character, and while I believe that one should get all that he can get out of the indirect effects through literature, through play, through history, through music, or through any other agency, I am perfectly clear in my own mind that we need to present a positive and direct program in moral and civic instruction in every grade in the public schools.

Now keep in mind the fact that this does not mean lectures on moral education by the teacher.

I gave you in detail one incident to let you see how little it means that. Neither does it mean the mere repeating of moral codes such as, "I am altruistic," "I look out for the rights of others," "I am not selfish," and so forth. I have never been able to see how one could depend upon

five minutes of such lip service as the basis of a program in moral and civic education.

I repeat, then, that the results that we have obtained so far are most encouraging. On the other hand, it is quite clear that we need to emphasize that we do not have scientific data at the present time which enable us to see with complete confidence that we are on the best road. Certainly, a final answer to many of the most important questions cannot now be given.

The next twenty-five or thirty years should see greater emphasis on research in this field than has ever been seen in any other field of education. We have devoted science to material progress; we must now devote science to the study of the betterment of the conduct of individuals, because it is at that point that our failure is manifest.

In this field of direct instruction in moral education, it must be recognized that without proper method, and without proper sympathetic attitudes such as I described in the illustration of the work of one first-grade teacher, the best intentions on the part of teachers may come to nothing. We need to map out specifically all the situations to which these people must be taught to respond properly. We need to give them a consensus of judgment as to what should be done in those situations, and more than that, we need to develop on their part a strong emotional bias in favor of appropriate conduct. We need to develop conduct on the basis of taste. It has always been a maxim, in teaching morals, that until the individual does what is right as a matter of feeling and as a matter of taste, he cannot be safely left to act as he should act.

With all this talk about teaching the pupil to think for himself, it must be kept in mind that life is so complicated and the wisdom of the race so subtle that unless one is reinforced by proper sentiments and tastes and feelings, it is always all too easy to think of a logical-sounding excuse for doing what one knows perfectly well he ought not to do.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION: CULTURAL NEEDS OF THE CHILD

CULTURAL NEEDS OF THE CHILD

The Luncheon Round Table Discussion on the Cultural Needs of the Child held under the auspices of the Central Council of Childhood Education, and following the Mid-West Conference on Parent-Education, convened at 1:45 P.M. in the Grand Ball Room of the Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, Miss Alta Adkins, President of the Central Council of Childhood Education, Chicago, presiding. The program opened with a delightful group of songs beautifully rendered by Charles Lewis Graves, tenor, accompanied by Mary Pearce Niemann.

CHAIRMAN ADKINS: I begrudge every minute that I must use, for it delays hearing something valuable from these people we have with us today. I will have to take a few minutes, however, for it is only due to the Central Council, which holds its meetings here in Chicago, that we should have just a word about its purposes.

The people who organized that Council had been, for a number of years, very active in kindergarten and primary organizations here in Chicago. They felt that it was wrong to keep the kindergarten an issue by itself, and the primary school another issue by itself. The same group wanted to go to all meetings. The various groups had common interests, although they had, in a number of cases, of course, special problems. So the Central Council was formed, uniting those groups. The Chicago Kindergarten Club, which for years had been an inspiration to teachers, was the first one to come in. The Chicago branch

of the National Council of Primary Education gave up its regular meetings that its members might attend the Central Council. The members of the state branch of the Illinois Kindergarten Primary Group came in and are members of that through the Council.

The hope of the Council is that the feeling of unity, the conviction that members of the different departments of education should not be isolated, but that people should work together, will be realized. It is this hope that the Central Council wishes to express to you today and this hope that the Council wishes everyone who is in contact with it to feel.

A very significant movement which shows the trend along this line occurred in Washington just a week ago when two organizations came together. The Kindergarten Department and the National Council of Primary Education have been having their meetings separately, the interests from one flashing over to the interest of the other, until the unity of purpose became markedly evident to all. So it was decided that the National Education Association be asked to change the name of the Kindergarten Department, to the Department of Childhood Education, that it might include preschool workers on the one hand and the elementary grades on the other. The feeling was very strong that grades above the primary need to be considered part of the unit of childhood education. It is wrong to cut off the spirit of primary, kindergarten, and nursery education at the end of the third grade and say, "Now in the fourth grade you can sit and get your lessons out of books, and you don't need to do anything else." So the move was made requesting a Department of Childhood Education.

I won't take any more time to mention the purpose of the Central Council. It meets the first Saturday of every month in Chicago, in the Central Eleanor Club Rooms, 17 N. State Street, at 10:30 A.M., and attempts to unite the interests of workers throughout the district, forming ideals, interchanging experiences, and influencing procedure.

One of the most outstanding things, one of the greatest inspirations of this meeting has been the fact that the members of the Chicago Association for Child Study, which has planned this great Conference, are parents instead of teachers. We teachers have heretofore pushed and pushed and pushed to bring such things about. It is indeed a thrilling event to have parents take the lead so splendidly, and do something as far-reaching in its influence as they have done in this Conference. It has been a most happy association that our Council and the Child Study Organization have had together.

We are especially fortunate this afternoon in having not only these splendid speakers who belong in our midst, but also some guests of distinguished note, and as Miss Hill of Columbia University is with us, and has to leave early, we are asking her right now to give you a word of greeting. We told her she could give just as many words as she wished, because we want to hear every word she has to say.

Miss Patty Smith Hill (Professor of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University): Members of the Central Council of Childhood Education and of the Chicago Association for Child Study. I am today somewhat overwhelmed by finding out what I should have probably known except for my leave of absence abroad,

that you had made this organization. I think it is a wonderful step. The whole keynote of education, national, industrial, and social reform now seems along the line of uniting many varieties of organizations into one and making some one strong, able, efficient piece of work to be accomplished.

We should have done something like this in my own home town and I said to Miss Temple, as I was talking over the whole thing with her, that except for the fact that life is such a rushing thing in New York (of course you don't have any such guilty thing as that here), I would go right back home and say, "We must catch up with Chicago and do something of this kind."

This is literally true. When I come away from the little Island out into the West and hear reports such as we heard last week from the state of Iowa, I find myself thrilled with the fine things you are doing and this really is a step that I hope is a standard for other organizations all over the country. You certainly can all together have some one fine piece of work, and you can attend the meeting offered by one organization, whereas you cannot attend all of these varieties of meetings offered by different organizations. I congratulate you heartily, and I hope that it not only will be a standard for us, but a standard for other people.

I also want to take this occasion again to congratulate the Association for Child Study for their meeting here. We had one, as you, in the East in New York this fall, and it has been my privilege to attend both. It is a wonderful thing in the history of—I started to say education, probably larger—of American civilization, that these mothers are organizing, working, and pushing it

themselves. That has been said many times but we ought not forget what a remarkable thing it is that these great gatherings have taken place, and I have no doubt that two months will not go by before we will be invited to one out on the Pacific Coast. I am quite sure they will have one out there. They certainly will not be outdone by the Middle West and the East.

The thing that impresses me is this: I see many friendly faces in the audience. I know they will smile. To me it is more and more true every day I live that we cannot hope to do anything for the children in our midst in the schools until we remember that we are just one of the children's teachers, and that the most effective teachers of all are at home. I like to say it with our teachers over and over again; the two great learning situations in which children live are the school and the home, and we must regard parents as teachers and ourselves as mothers. When we take on the fine qualities of the mother, and mothers take on the fine qualities of the teacher, and we regard ourselves as the *two* teachers in the *two* situations, we will get somewhere with these children.

It gives me the greatest pleasure to be with you today and to carry the message back to my little Island in New York.

CHAIRMAN ADKINS: In selecting the subjects for discussion at this luncheon, we felt that the cultural needs of children should receive special attention. Many topics have been discussed during the conference concerning the growth of children, but we want to have some of the cultural influences touched upon specifically. Not that the others are not cultural; there are cultural phases to all of

them, but there are some subjects which seem to put a finishing touch upon the ideals, and the interests of children. For that reason we have friends with us today who will talk upon music and upon creative dancing.

The first of these speakers will be Mrs. Kern of the University of Chicago. I am sure she needs no introduction. Her work in music is known everywhere as lovely.

CULTURAL INFLUENCE OF MUSIC

Mrs. Mary Root Kern, School of Education, University of Chicago

It is a great privilege to be allowed to speak on one's hobby, especially when it has been so kindly referred to as it has now. I think music has fought its battle and has taken its proper place with us all in school work, but a great deal of progress has been made recently in its handling and its presentation. It has become a very much more vital thing in its correlation with other parts of the curriculum and with its effect on the child's own life and experience. The reaction that we get from children in music can now be measured better than it ever used to be because they are allowed more freedom of expression in their responses. We find out better how they react to it, what they like, and what is useful for them to have.

I was thinking this morning when I saw the babies on the screen playing with a ring or a rattle or whatever it was, that that was a very good place to begin the child's musical education by giving him something which has a beautiful tone. Our nurseries are equipped with beautiful color and with modern improvements for their physical well-being, but I think beautiful tone rarely is considered

in the nursery, and we all know that cradle culture is a very important feature in culture. We like to begin early with little children in giving them what will make for a natural, instinctive response to beauty, so in the nursery, failing the mother's voice (what Whitman calls the delicious singing of the mother's voice) we should have something which the child may listen to as lovely tone.

In the home I think much of the implanted light and music comes when the child is very little. When he is playing with his blocks, if he hears lovely music it is going to have its effect upon him. Dr. Charters, in a recent lecture which he called "The Re-Education of Parents," mentioned the fact that it is very difficult to impress upon our children what we have not ourselves in morality, in kindness, in honesty. He named many things. I think the musical atmosphere of the home will react upon the child so strongly that no matter how ambitious the parents may be to have the child finally musical, he is not so apt to be unless the parents themselves cultivate in their home the feeling for beautiful and cultural music.

Of course, nowadays we have a great deal of mechanical music, I was going to say, to contend with. It is very useful, where the other kind is not available, but where the first-hand music is available, I believe that is still better.

One of the great objections to mechanical music is that it very rarely is listened to with respect. Usually if a record is being played, or the radio is giving us something that is worth while listening to, it is very difficult to create an audience in the house. It is very difficult to really be quiet and listen to it. To have the right effect from beautiful music we must have quiet, because tone, the

quality of tone, is almost a spiritual thing, if it is beautiful, and we cannot have it interfered with.

I think that in music appreciation very often the teacher hunts for another record while one is being played or winds the instrument while it is being played. In that way she does not create the right atmosphere for the appreciation that she wants. Real music appreciation is an emotional thing, an emotional reaction, and to be quiet and allow that emotional reaction to come is part of her use as a teacher, because children imitate so much what they see. If the teacher shows respect for a beautiful thing the children are very much more apt to show that respect and wait for the thing she wants them to get.

In school singing I feel that the tone is pre-eminently the desirable field for work, especially in the younger grades. If we have established beautiful tone with the little children it will persist in the older grades.

I read the other day of a principal who said that he did not wish to give a place to music because he would just as leave hear a flock of ducks quacking as children singing. The people to whom that was said were very indignant but I did not feel so indignant. I have heard class singing that was a great deal like the quacking of a flock of ducks. You know if a child is doing a thing reluctantly, he is very apt to speak in a flat, nasal way, and unless he is given something that seems charming to him, it is going to be difficult for us to get the class tone that we want.

A few poor voices ruin the class tone. Maybe you remember Dr. Ricks on the *Voice Training of Public School Children,* in which he says that the child voice is the most beautiful musical instrument. Those of us who have spent

a great deal of time in getting rid of the obstacles to the child's beautiful tone realize the truth of that statement. If we take our little children who are singing normally and let them sing by themselves, a little model chorus, maybe in the kindergarten, or the first or second or third grade, we get the most thrilling, beautiful resonance, a silvery quality that is as charming as any tone that we can hear.

I think it is the duty of the young teacher to know how to get that tone and how to preserve it, and so I am going to say a few practical things today on that subject. The vowel sound of "oo" sung on a high pitch gains the sound or tone that we want. The child cannot sing "oo" on a high pitch in his wrong voice quality, and his right voice quality is beautiful, and will be beautiful. To find little exercises and words that contain this desirable vowel quality and let the children sing on a high pitch, before they begin the singing of their songs, will help not only to establish in their own mind the tone that you want, but it will persist more or less through the entire song.

In this month of February my older children have been singing "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." I think maybe it is the last time I shall ever teach a war song, but I did not realize until they were all singing it how much emotion was aroused by it. But the thing I shall not give up will be the chorus of "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah," for it is the best voice training exercise that I know.

The little children love to say the words as soon as they have learned it, and "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah" has in it enough of vitality to be perfectly charming for them to sing. Whereas the syllable "lu" on the high pitch beats this lovely voice quality that I want to have above all things in my music work.

Many other little exercises of that sort can be used, and it is well worth while to spend a minute or two or three, of the music period, with exercise on a high pitch with the vowel sound of "oo," and the teacher with initiative can find little phrases which contain that and which are charming in this thought to the child, something that will make his voice vital.

I was interested recently in a Symphony Concert when the cellist, Cassaels, was the soloist. After he had finished his number he played a few selections from a suite of Bach. These did not contain any marvelous requirements for dexterity, but were of such exquisite tone that after he had been recalled six or eight times, the whole audience rose. That was a tribute to tone quality, for certainly the Bach melody and the Bach technical requirements are not such as to excite anyone, but this beautiful tone produced an effect which I have not seen at Orchestra Hall for a great many years.

Let us remember that to make music cultural for the children, to make it lovely to them, we must work indirectly, not insist, but work indirectly for this beautiful tone quality which all through their musical life will color their own enjoyment in their work and that of other people.

To gain enough mastery of the various technicalities in children's music, I think the teachers should be able to select songs from a clear basis of what they want to gain. Fortunately, today we have beautiful music to select from for children, and if the purpose in the teacher's mind is to get a fine, accurate rhythm she can find a song which will naturally bring forth fine accurate rhythm. There are percussive consonants so that the children come in on the

exact accent and no word need be said about it. They are imitative. If she gives them the model with this perfect rhythm and good vital speech they will respond with that. If she wants fine tone quality she will select the song with the round vowels on the high notes of the song, and on many of the accents through it. If she wants something which will bring an emotional response from them she can find an art song, so called, which is so beautiful of itself that she loves it and then the children will love it.

I am glad to see that the important music publishers are now publishing accompaniments with the songs for the children, and more and more a keyboard instrument should be and will be in the room where the music lesson is given. I read the other day that in the city of Pittsburgh it is a law that every primary lesson shall be given with a keyboard instrument, and the little, inexpensive pianos and the inexpensive organs which can easily be moved from room to room make it possible for the children to have the enrichment of harmony for their singing.

Music appreciation in the younger grades at all events may be accomplished through beautiful piano or organ accompaniment. The children will not need special lessons in music appreciation. They are in a hurry to get through the technical work of reading and of learning the melody and the words, and say, "Now play it with two hands." They want that enrichment of the accompaniment because of its beauty, not to help them to sing it because they have already learned to sing it, but because of the beauty. If in these early grades they learn to love a beautiful song, that is the foundation for one of the greatest joys they can have through life.

I feel that the learning of beautiful songs and singing them requires as much self-control as any other activity in their young lives. Self-control, social work, social feeling, and a certain sense of something more lovely than anything that they get elsewhere comes with the singing of beautiful songs. After we have been singing a very beautiful song the children show their response to that in leaving my room. They come to me for music and they leave by saying, "Goodbye, Mrs. Kern," or, "See you tomorrow." It means that there is a little social feeling which is quite other from the jumping up and hurrying out to their next class. It is a little response to me. It is as much as if they said, "We have been having a beautiful time," "This has been very precious to us," as it is to me.

The chances that we have at present in Chicago in the orchestral concerts that Mr. Stock is giving to the children and that can be received by radio are wonderful. Beautiful records of the work also show the quality of the different instruments. We are especially fortunate in this day and generation in being able to give to the children in a most beautiful way what we used to have to preach to them about—we give it to them so that they, themselves, get it without our interference.

Chairman Adkins: As our topic this afternoon is "Cultural Influence" we wanted to include art, but were unable to get Professor Sargent from the University of Chicago as we had hoped. We have included creative dancing, and Mrs. Kranz, of Northwestern University, is to speak to us later, upon that subject.

As I said, we have some distinguished visitors with us this afternoon. We have at the table Professor Alma

Binzel, and I want you to be sure to hear just a how-do-you-do from her. I believe that before Mrs. Kranz talks we will have Miss Binzel for just a moment.

It is a great privilege to introduce to you Miss Alma Binzel, lecturer upon parent education.

Miss Binzel: Madam Chairman, I think what you ought to label me in the future is, "pedagogical tramp," because I am really not tied up for any length of time during the year to any organization. That is, I am with an organization for eight weeks, or some other organization for a week, maybe a kindergarten club for three days, and some other organization for exactly one day, or for one hour.

What makes me a pedagogical tramp? I suppose because I revolted somewhat as a kindergartner. Most of you know John Watson and a number of other people, like Dr. Bagley, who came to the International Kindergarten Union meetings time and time again. They told us how important we were because we had the children first, and we were to unkink the kinks that the kindly, well-intentioned, terribly loving, but awfully uninformed parents put into the personalities and character of children.

You know, to be told year in and year out that you are the most important part of the public-school system because you are a kindergarten teacher finally leads you to ask the question, "Well, if the kindergartners with two or more years of study of child life can unkink and then build up, wouldn't a few years of similar training on the part of the parents, supposing that their intelligence quotients are about as good in general as the intelligence quotients of those of us who stay in teaching rather than

parenthood, wouldn't the intelligence of parents profit by just such study, and make it possible for the parents to do correct kinking, appropriate to the first four years of child life so that when we as kindergartners get them we can just put in the next kinks?"

I rebelled being told that I was to be an unkinker and then a kinker, and I began to talk about parental and pre-parental education, and I have very learned friends who said, "Miss Binzell, for heaven's sake, don't use those phrases. You will scare people if you use such words. You had better call the whole business child welfare."

Again I rebelled, and I said, "If it is all right to talk about children and child study, why isn't it right to talk about the other, parental and pre-parental education?" So I cut out connections with various universities and began to talk this thing.

I am going to wind up by saying I congratulate not only the kindergarten, the primary, and the elementary-school teacher in organizing under the general title "Council of Childhood Education" in this, the central Middle West, but I want to congratulate the Chicago Association for Child Study that it had the courage to put, "and Parent Education," in its title. You have taken the most forward step. You are not afraid to say that parents should be educated and that it is perfectly legitimate.

I have asked, and prophesied, that in the very near future we would have parents buildings in large cities that would rival, not in elegance of structure and decoration and so forth, the handsome men's and women's club houses, lodges, and so forth, but that we would have large buildings adequate for the service that parents should

render each other. I have prophesied in various communities such buildings within five years. I have prophesied departments of parental education in privately endowed and also state-endowed universities, and to have to come here to Chicago and hear Harvard men and Yale men and Minnesota men and Iowa men talk not only about parental education, but pre-parental education, at the third or fourth grade, as Dr. Gesell hinted at this morning, is certainly going beyond me a little bit. I had talked about it at about the seventh and eighth grade.

I want to express my very deep appreciation of this opportunity of being here in Chicago for this perfect three days. I had the opportunity, too, of being in New York City last October and November for that first big parenthood conference. If Miss Hill were here she would be glad to know that this very month of March on the California Coast right in the Bay cities, there is also a parenthood conference in progress. There have already been two parenthood conferences in Brooklyn in the East, so you see how tremendous the sweep of this interest is. It makes it perfectly legitimate to say that the outstanding new feature in education during this coming quarter of the twentieth century is parental education and pre-parental education; and grandmothers here in Chicago have already told me that the thing is under way which will organize them into a child study group from the grandparents' points of view.

Chairman Adkins: Now we will ask Mrs. Kranz, of Northwestern University, to give us a talk on Creative Dancing.

CREATIVE DANCING

Mrs. Margaret Schulv Kranz, School of Speech, Northwestern University

When Miss Bower asked me to speak I objected very strenuously. I wrote to her several times and mentioned different names of people who could do it. It was not because I was not enthusiastic about it, but because I wanted somebody who could really instil enthusiasm into you to speak to you. I want so badly to have the world realize what dancing can do in the educational field. I think I feel more or less apologetic to speak to such a group as this, but I must say that selfishly I am glad I did decide to speak, because of the inspiration I have received. I think everybody feels the things they are interested in is the panacea for all ills. Being a very normal individual, I found that to be true, and everything said yesterday in the child-study meeting just seemed to fit my type of work.

I should mention right here that at intervals I should be making quotation marks, because all the while I am speaking I will be quoting. What I am saying has been inspired by Miss Margaret Doebler, of the University of Wisconsin, with whom I studied, and whose work I am following. I am sure a great many of you know Miss Doebler and her work. Again I say I want to be apologetic in speaking to this group. I feel many of you are as enlightened on the subject, perhaps, as I am. I have been working along this line so much (six years), that it seems to me everybody must know it. However, occasionally, just the other day, I was attending a woman's club, and in one of the individual rooms a little class was having dancing—girls about eight years of age. I thought, "Oh, dear,

there are still some parents who are not quite enlightened." It happened to be in a neighborhood in which you would expect enlightened folks to be.

Dancing has always been thought of as something separate among the arts, as just decorative, perhaps, to physical education, as a recreation, something to build up the individual physically, and then, too, it has merely been an imitative process. Someone else has done the thinking and given it to the child to do. In that respect you can easily see that it has not correlated and been on a par with the new theories and new ideas in education.

I know that many different theories have been expounded here, and you all speak of theories of education. I won't mention any of them at all to argue about the theories, but if we enumerate any of the elements like self-activity and self-expression, some of the main thoughts in the new theories of education, and self-development of the individual, dancing from the old point of view has not fulfilled that requirement. It has not been on a par. The other arts have asserted themselves to a greater extent than the dance has. If we think of it as an imitative process, following out what somebody else has done in thought for us, we, of course, cannot consider it as an art. Art must be self-expressive.

We should consider it just from the point of view of skill. Dancing has so often been considered as something outside of the educational field that we have not realized that in itself it can correlate and bring in all the elements so worth while in education.

If we think of education as helping the individual to come from where he is to where he ought to be, as Hinman expresses it, or if we think of an individual during his

education getting the equipment for future life to make him a higher and better individual, to help him give greater service and to always be a happier individual because of that greater service, then we must correlate our dance into that, and we, of course, feel that we are able to do that.

As I said before, every person thinks his hobby is the thing that can do it; therefore, I think the dance should be so fundamentally given that it can adjust itself to any age and to the requirements of the age, not only the age with respect to the individual, but the age of history or evolution.

It has been most interesting to me to work with the dance from a new point of view. Miss Doebler, who has really worked on the problem of the dance as an educational institution, has worked with people electing it, people taking it because they knew they would enjoy it and wanted to work with it. I took it in that respect and always did love the response to music, the feeling of well being and the expressive reactions, but I did not know just how it would react after I got out among people who had to take it. During my first year away from Wisconsin I taught at the University of Colorado and there people elected it and I was very much encouraged. I thought it might be Miss Doebler's wonderful personality, and I was so relieved to find it was the work itself. Then when I was transferred to Northwestern, I was appalled that Dean Dennis at the School of Speech thought this type of work was the best suited to his particular need in the dramatic and self-expression field. I was very much appalled to find that everybody had to take it, and I, being a very sensitive individual, just wanting so badly to have

everybody want to take it, and enjoy it (you cannot imagine how it hurts to have some one in your group not enjoying what you enjoy), was very much worried. Of course, being my first year there I wanted to do what was right, so I thought that I would go ahead and see what would happen.

I was relieved and surprised and delighted to find in one year that no matter what point of view they started with, Miss Doebler's work was so fundamental they all enjoyed it, and with that one year I felt quite positive that the work was so all-round and fundamental that it suited any type of individual.

I remember so well one girl who later on at the end of the year (I am so glad she didn't tell me at the first of the year, I would have been very self-conscious) said that she had not planned to take the course because the minute she found out she had to take dancing she did not want it. She didn't think it suited her at all. It was important for certain individuals, but not for her. She was a great debater, a splendid orator, and she thought it would be no place for her if she had to take dancing. Well, she had to take it, and she stayed in school, and at the end of the year confessed she was amazed that there was something so fundamental and such a satisfaction in the self-expressive end of it. She realized it was not something outside of herself. There was something in the work really a part of herself.

Miss Doebler in her interpretation, has taken the point of view of man and his process of evolution and his reactions in every possible way.

Of course, you people think of it in relation to the child. The mother often decides that "Now is the time for

my daughter to take dancing." But she does not stop to realize that she should correlate that with other fields of education, that the mother should have a certain aim in her education and see that the type of dancing she is taking correlates with her aims and ideas of education. But I feel a great deal about this like the previous speaker did about kinking. I would like to have classes of mothers just to have them realize how fundamental dancing is, and then have them decide for themselves, because we feel more and more we want to give the child something which will develop him.

We so often think of the dance as making the child beautiful in bodily reactions, graceful in response to music, but we never stop to think about whether the connection between the mind, the soul, and the body is made, whether we have correlation in that respect. Our trend of physical education is, of course, moving toward that end. All education is moving that way. We no longer think of them as being separate parts, but a correlation of all the parts, so we want to keep in mind that these are the three elements that should enter in—the mind, the soul, and the body.

We want to remember that in our education the dance should promote the growth of the individual, should stimulate the child to creative activity, and make him self-expressive. As Dr. Horn this morning said, "We want self-expression and greater poise. Self-expression alone is not the greatest fulfillment that we wish; we want self-expression with responsibility." Here, too, we want to give that self-expression something which is big, something which has depth, not something just exterior.

I have so often seen a little child trained in the set

and old form of the dance. It has lovely movement, and when she is giving her dance you feel the whole audience appreciates it. It is a realization of the beauty of form and movement, but I realize that the dance is just from her neck down. Perhaps the child is lovely in herself. It is the loveliness of the child which just cannot help but express itself, but the child is so intent on getting those steps just right, and to fit in with the music, that if the music is wrong in a certain part, the child hesitates. She is so intent that the natural loveliness she wants to radiate and should radiate is held in check.

I find that when girls come to college they so often have had dancing before, and there are certain things we have to break down before we can get to the real individual. I have a girl in mind who just recently has shown the dramatic ability she has. Before this she was always pulling taffy in everything she was doing. The work of her arms had come from such a set training she could not really express the thing she had in mind. She was so trained in her movements she could do nothing else but just pull taffy. All of a sudden the light has come to her, and she has to break all this down before she can really express herself and be herself.

I could, of course, speak on this forever, but I want to enumerate a few things that we think of in giving dancing to the college student. One of the things that Miss Doebler's work does, so often neglected, is the realization that this age is an age of tension, and we have to work for relaxation. I would just love to experiment on you who are here, and ask you to relax. You would be amazed how hard it is to relax; how you have to think about it and work for it. You must establish a connection between

your mind and muscle before you can really have that relaxation.

If we want to aim for that in the college girl, then certainly we want to do something in choosing our type of work for the child not to bring that tension in, because the child has that natural ability of relaxation and flexibility. It is amazing how soon we tie up and tense up. I have been working with children, and it is surprising how soon the muscles become tense, how the nerve reaction is so strong that the body is no longer flexible and relaxed as we so much need it in this day and age.

Then we think of the problem of relieving self-consciousness. That, of course, is an element that has to be gotten rid of before we can really express ourselves. If we are working with that with the grown-up child, or the college girl, we certainly want to do everything not to bring that element into the younger child, because he will not be self-conscious in earlier years unless it is thrust upon him. That is the part of the work which is so helpful. It is true the other type of instruction emphasized solo work to such a great extent, but we like to all work together. It is the fun of working together, the social element and the fact that self-consciousness is relieved through that social element, the fact that we are getting aid from somebody else that makes it so valuable. The whole trend in the work before, of course, has been a certain set movement, and our whole trend has gotten away from that; we want to get natural movement.

The ballet and the set work itself aims to stretch certain muscles and to have the individual get certain bal-

ance and control but our certain trend now is to get into the natural way. For example, physical education first taught us to walk with the toe first and down at the heel; now we think of it in its natural and best way, using the foot as we would normally to its best and most hygienic value. All education is following that same trend. The dance is getting back to the natural, the easy, free movement of the body, the way we will be able to use it all the rest of our lives. When we think of the physical work, we want to think of what it will do to the individual when forty or fifty, and so on. That is why when we teach college students hygiene and physiology they think it is not for them because they have not felt any of the needs as yet. If we could only instil the idea of what we have to, or might have to, endure at forty, or fifty, we would have a much easier time.

Our problem has been changing the individual from set work, strained work, artificial poses, and reactions to the natural, but we have forgotten the fact that we want to use the mind in relation to it.

We find such wonderful opportunities to correlate the arts, the art of music with the art of dancing. I know that some of the girls have felt that if they had had nothing else than the appreciation and the feeling, the bodily reaction to music, it would still have been very worth while. In working with the dance we should always just use good music, so we give the college girl that musical analysis to give her a greater appreciation of music and of the bodily response to it. Of course, in the child we want to have something like that, give it good music so it

can be inspired, and have the inspiration of the music, and carry it along all the rest of its life. You have sometimes worked with a certain lovely piece of music and when you hear it again you have a friendly attitude toward it, and you feel a part of it.

Then we want to break down inhibitions. That is one of the things now in the work. You notice a little tiny child has many, many movements first, and all her movements will be crude, but finally they will blend down to the movement you want and can use. If we have to break down many inhibitions due to self-consciousness, tension, wrong muscular reaction, if we have to break them down in a grown-up child, we want to see that they do not enter into the small child, and see that it keeps its flexibility, its motor control, guidance, poise, and bodily action.

And then almost our hardest work with the college girl is to reinstate that inborn imagination and that creative ability, that spiritual something which every child has. I would like to mention here that I am coming to these meetings not only as an educator, but also as a mother, and I know myself that I would give anything to retain that lovely, radiating, spiritual something that this little ten-year-old girl of mine has. Some way I would never want that to be held in check. I want to turn it into the right trend, to give it something big and beautiful and fine. So if we want to instil that imagination into the older child, we certainly want to give everything and do everything to retain it in the little child.

My plea is that if we parents are considering the art of the dance for the child, by all means think of it as high

as the other elements in education; consider your aims and education and then choose your dance accordingly.

CHAIRMAN ADKINS: This last gathering seems to be a little like a family party, and it would be the finest touch of all if we could have you meet some of the people who have helped to make it a success, but the hour is late. We will just say goodby, and Godspeed until we meet again, mothers and teachers, together.

INDEX

INDEX

Address of welcome, 1
Adjustments of later adolescense, 195 ff.
Adkins, Alta, 295
Adolescent, problems of the, 181 ff.
Adolescent period, characteristics of, 183
Adolescent training, imperative aims in, 183 ff.
Aims in adolescent training, 183
Alschuler, Mrs. Alfred S., 133
Anderson, John E., 98

Baldwin, Dr. Bird T., 149
Beatty, Willard W., 166
Behaviorisms, 123
Binzel, Alma, 307
Blanton, Margaret Gray, 33
Boaz, quoted, 267
Burnham, William H., 183
Burt, quoted, 271
Burton, E. D., quoted, 139

Campbell, quoted, 236
Central Council of Childhood Education, 295
Character: defined, 234; development of, 110; training for, 215; of youth of today, 243
Character-building, 179
Character-training, 178
Charters, Dr. Werrett Wallace, 9
Child, the: and constructive discipline, 41; and emotional life of parent, 38; as an individual, 36; tired, 71–82; and unfulfilled desires of parent, 37
Child study, 2
Child Study Association of America, 4
Child-guidance clinic, aims of, 42, 43
Childhood: determinisms in, 112 ff.; a selected period of life, 113
Children and the truth, 40
Civic education, instruction in, 280 ff.
Cod-liver oil, 60, 61
Conflict situations, 145
Congenital word blindness, 276
Control of fears and worries, 13
Creative dancing, 310
Cultural needs of the child, 295 ff.
Cunningham, Dr. Bess, 147

Dancing, creative, 310
Davenport, quoted, 116
Death, truth about, 41
Death-rate: and health supervision, 48, 49; of infants, low in Chicago, 49
Dearborn, Walter F., 267
Delinquency, sex, 176
Department of Health, 135
Determinisms in childhood, 112 ff.
Detroit kindergarten tests, 142
Dewey theory, 145

Direct instruction in civic and moral education, 280 ff.
Discipline, constructive, 41
Downing, quoted, 129
Drake, Mrs. Daphne, 5

Early years, importance of, 83 ff.
Educative equipment for the child, 108 ff.
Eggs, importance of, in diet, 148
Eliot, Dr. Martha M., 58
Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund, 135
Emancipation from the home, 196–205
Emerson, quoted, 118
Emotional stability, 105
Endocrinology, 122
Energy of children 98
Environment, 2, 35, 36, 101 ff., 116, 118
Evolution, 113
Examination: mental, of babies, 90; physical, 136 ff., 90
Examinations and the child, 51

Father, the, 91, 218; responsibility of, 222 ff.; and sex education, 175
Fatherhood, attitude to, 231
Fatigue, 71 ff., tests for, 72
Fear: control of, 13; of death, 41
Franklin Nursery School, 134
Freedom of the child, 106
Freud, 125, 126

Gesell, Dr. Arnold, 255
Gesell tests, 142
Goddard, quoted, 194
Gruenberg, Mrs. Sidonie Matsner, 5, 153

Habits, 241
Health habits and fatigue, 73 ff.
Health schedule, 78 ff.
Health supervision: definition of, 47–48; need of continuous, 47–57; aims of, 53
Hedger, Dr. Caroline, 47
Heliotherapy, 58
Heterosexuality, 196, 205–14
Heredity, 34, 35, 53, 116, 120
Hill, Patty Smith, 87, 147, 297
Hippocrates, 58
Home: change in, 90, 91; and control, 14; environment furnished by, 2; and mental health, 33; and obedience, 11; opportunity of the modern, 9; a place of friendships and happiness, 13; and the rational attitude, 11, 12; and sex education, 162
Horn, Ernest, 280
Hull-House, 141
Huxley, quoted, 240

Impulses, 124
Infancy and mental hygiene, 259
Infant health, 49, 50
Infant Welfare Society, 50
Instinctive behavior, 34
Instincts, 124
Institute for Juvenile Research, 139 ff.
Intellect, 124
Intellectual development, 267
Intelligence and character, 233
Iowa State University, Preschool Laboratories, 134
Irwin and Marks, quoted, 268

Kawin, Ethel, 139
Kern, Mrs. Mary Root, 300

Kilpatrick, quoted, 116
Kranz, Mrs. Margaret Schulv, 310
Kuhlman-Binet test, 142

Lawton, Mrs. Eva L., 1
Learning process, the, 196 ff.
Léo, Gontraud, 59
Linguistic play, 109

Martin, quoted, 237, 250
Mason, Max, v
Mental deficiency, 114
Mental health, mobilizing for, 33
Mental health program, 139
Mental hygiene, 259
Merrill Palmer School tests, 142
Method of teaching sex education, 166
Mill, John Stuart, quoted, 223
Montessori Houses of Childhood, 87
Moral education, instruction in, 280 ff.
Moral qualities, development of, 110
Mother, the, 224; change in status of, 91; and sex education, 175
Motivation of young child, 98
Murchison, quoted, 236, 248
Murphy, Mary E., 135
Music, cultural influence of, 300
Myrick, Helen, 153

National conference of nursery schools, 133
National Kindergarten College, 141
Neumann, Henry, 222
Nursery school, 86, 87 ff.; equipment of, 88; needed by certain mothers, 93 ff.; and present social order, 87 ff.; and Saturday and Sunday, 109; workers in, 142
Nursery school program, 136 ff.
Nursery schools, research possibilities in, 133
Nurture, 116
Nutrition, 54; work in, 50

Obedience and the home, 11
Opportunity of the home, 9

Parents: influence of the, on school children, 267; present-day, 255; and sex education, 155, 174
Parent education, social significance of, 260
Parenthood, profession of, 33
Pattern reactions, inherited, 100
Pediatrician, work of, 34
Personality, integration of, 185
Personality traits, 143
Physical health program, 135
Pintner-Patterson tests, 142
Preschool age, the social importance of, 255
Preschool child, the, and the parent, 255 ff.
Preschool education, 87
Prevention, program of, 51
Problems of training teachers, 9
Problem situations, 143
Program for Conference, 4
Program of prevention, 51
Prostitution and sex education, 176
Psychiatrist, work of, 34
Psychic determinisms, 127
Psychologist, work of, 34
Purpose of Association, 1

Rational attitude and the home, 12
Rational habits, schedule for, 78 ff.
Research material, 145
Rickets, 60, 63, 114, 115; and cod-liver oil, 60
Rollier, 58–59

Seham, Dr. Max, 71
Self-activity, 192
Self-determination, 10
Self-discovery in adolescents, 184
Sex education, 153 ff.; methods of teaching, 166; and parents, 155, 174; prostitution and, 176; Winnetka plan for, 160
Sex information, 153 ff.
Social contacts provided in nursery school, 109 ff.
Social determinisms, 128
Social success of adolescents, 188
Stanford-Binet test, 142
Study group, advantages of, 3
Subefficiency, chronic, 74 ff.
Sun baths, 62–70; rules for, 70; technique of, 65
Sunlight, 58–71
Superstitions, old, 120

Teachers: influence of the, on intellectual development of children, 267 ff.; and sex education, 164
Ten Commandments, 247
Tests, 142
Tired child, the, 71–82
Truth: and children, 40; about death, 41; about sex, 153 ff.
Tuberculosis, 58, 59

Ultra-violet rays, 61, 62
University of Iowa Welfare Station, 145

Washburne, Carleton, 160
White, Edna N., 85
Wile, Dr. Ira S., 112, 233
Williams, Dr. Frankwood, 195
Winnetka plan for sex education, 160
Woodward, Frederic Campbell, 217
Woodworth, quoted, 113

Yale studies of early mental growth, 263
Yarros, Dr. Rachelle S., 174
Youth of today, character of, 243

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD/ALAMEDA COUNTY
482 WEST MacARTHUR BOULEVARD
OAKLAND, CA. 94609

PLANNED PARENTHOOD/ALAMEDA COUNTY
482 WEST MacARTHUR BOULEVARD
OAKLAND, CA. 94609